

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_99638
Title of the Manuscript:	BEST's disease :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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes of course,the Manuscript is of great importance to the Community because is the disease that affect humanity in an environment of which is needed to talked about, it's Implication, management and a way forward.,been that it has no cure for now. (1b)The Manuscript is a welcome development that all should know about in case of one starts experiencing not to entertain fear.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is not really Suitable. Am suggesting that it should be given.... (a) Juvenile Onset Vitelliform (b) Vitelliform Dystrophy (c) Best Macular Dystrophy....all meant Best disease because is an academic write up which supposed to have a Captivating Caption to attract Research.</p> <p>(3). Yes the Abstract is very much Comprehensive because it was a case study Research which Captured the necessary rudiments like. (a) Patient description (b) Case history (c) Physical examination results (d) Results of Pathology test ..etc.</p> <p>(4) The Sub section are accurate and appropriate ad well. (5) The Manuscript is Scientifically Correct....The Researchers did his/ her very best. (6) The References are okay and in other. Can g</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language used is a Scholarly acceptable	
<p>Optional/General comments Generally Speaking,the Researcher knew the Subject matter and should be considered</p>		

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:	Oguejiofor, Chidumebi Ngozi
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikwe University, Nigeria