

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_83960
Title of the Manuscript:	Angioid Streaks and Systemic Pathologies. Is There Always This Association?
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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:

(<https://www.journalor.com/index.php/OR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Title</b> Should be changed into (Angioid Streaks and Systemic Pathologies. Is This Association Always There?)  <b>Abstract and case Report sections</b> The authors mentioned that the patient is (male) then they prescribed (her.....) please confirm is the patient (male) then, it change into (his) or is the patient (female) , then change (male) into (female)	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Introduction section</b> No <u>sexual</u> predilection is described, should be changed into (no <u>gender</u> predilection)  <b>Conclusion</b> Remove the first paragraph (AS occur due to alterations..... disciform scars in the macula). You do not need to mention the aetiology of the disease in the conclusion. You need only to mention the important findings of your case report.  <b>References</b> There are too much references for such a case report (36 references). Please remove unnecessary references	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sherif Mohamed
Department, University & Country	Assiut University, Egypt