

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_99521
Title of the Manuscript:	Bilateral Bouchut tuberculoma complicating multifocal tuberculosis : a case report.
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.journalajrop.com/index.php/AJRROP/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		
<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>yes, it is important it highlighted the importance of retinal examination as part of the basic initial workup for all patients with suspected multifocal TB particularly HIV patients .</p> <p><b>yes title is suitable</b> <b>yes abstract well written</b> <b>yes subsections of article are appropriate</b> <b>Yes the manuscript is sufficiently correct but missing some important information in the history and methods of investigation to exclude other differential diagnosis.</b></p> <p>Yes references are sufficient . Only 20% of them are recent but majority need to be updated .</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	yes apart from some vocabularies which i had to search in the dictionary for its meaning .	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors haven't mentioned a full past-medical and social history, and specifically inquire about the patient's HIV status, when they were suspecting ocular TB. Also history of travel to TB endemic country, interaction with active TB patient, prior positive radiographic findings, tuberculin skin test (TST) or interferon-gamma release assay (IGRA).	

### 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:	Shatha Th. Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Ninevah University, Iraq