

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_115350
Title of the Manuscript:	exophthalmos revealing malignant lymphoma
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Yes. The authors have presented a rare case of non-hodgkin’s lymphoma of orbit clinically presenting as exophthalmos. Authors have not submitted any histopathological images of the tumor but submitted only CT images.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but incomplete without histopathological images</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Authors have mentioned that tissue biopsy and pathological study revealed stage 1 T-cell NHL but failed to submit histopathology images which is essential for diagnosis. Authors did not mention anything about obtaining parent’s consent. After the diagnosis, patient’s management and outcome of treatment, any follow up were not mentioned. Quoting reference numbers in the text is disorderly and some reference numbers are not mentioned in the text.</p>	<p>we were unable to obtain the anatomopathological images because the biopsy was processed in a private center where access to the images was difficult the evolution of the disease was not noted, as the patient had been referred for oncological treatment and did not return for ophthalmological check-ups</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Can be improved</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors need to provide full expansion of abbreviations used. They have mentioned “intra-conical” in case report which is to be corrected as ‘intra-conal’</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is very vague, not cohesive.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	