



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_12301
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Topical steroids, HIV status, CD4 cells and corneal health- a case report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case Study</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The observation that the pseudo-cornea formed after treatment with Gunderson's flap suture was interesting – however it is unclear if this is a standard surgical procedure for such cases. If the treatment is NOVEL then the paper warrants revision to emphasize this.</b></p> <p><b>The link between declining CD4 counts and steroid use requires further referenced discussion.</b></p> <p><b>A current review of the literature is required to support your hypothesis that synergistic effects may be measurable in a future study.</b></p> <p><b>No evidence or observation concerning CD4 counts were made by the authors for this case. Assumption and patient narration are not sufficient evidence for the report.</b></p> <p><b>Medical terminology should be used at all times and defined where necessary i.e. "quieter eye" i.e. subjective and must be defined.</b></p> <p><b>Drugs should have manufacturers listed and applications should be noted and categorised i.e antiviral, anti-inflammatory etc.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line number shown: 22 – define misuse, "a lot" is non scientific</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>24 – define innate mechanisms which may be modulated.                  25 – needs reference,.....this is where a lit review is needed.                  35-39 – categorise the drugs in terms of mode of action. Which ones are the steroids of concern in this case.                  48 – misuse of tense, sickler is not a correct term                  49 – misuse of tense                  54 – essentially                  82 – confusing use of word “paucity”, needs ref.                  83-86 – assumption- form a hypothesis instead.                  91 – define enabling environment                  94 – suggest some pathology included in your multiple factors                  99-100 – confusing language – what do you want the trail to study??                  104-106 – how does this relate to the case study if you have no evidence that the patient has HSV.                  107 – refs needed.                  111 – justify your use of steroids in the context of the study.                  113 – Clad is not a scientific term, define “not entertained”                  116 – what is the evidence for CD4 involvement in this case. You do not prove a link between CD4 decline and corneal melting, you have no measurement of CD4 levels.                  118 – poor grammar.....is this treatment NOVEL.</p> <p>Figures: Arrows are required with annotation for the observed damage to the cornea and structures of the eye.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Typos must be corrected and the grammar of the report is weak.</p>	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**