

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_115352
Title of the Manuscript:	Bardet Biedl syndrome and retinopathy pigmentosa: about a case
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript provides valuable clinical insights into Bardet-Biedl syndrome and retinitis pigmentosa, making it important for the scientific community- for making so, need a lot of improvement in the manuscript 2. Title can be revised as "Clinical Insights into Bardet-Biedl Syndrome and Retinitis Pigmentosa: A Case Report" 3. The abstract provides a brief overview of the case, highlighting key clinical features, but lacks comprehensive details- a need for improvement in depth and specificity regarding the case presentation along a brief about the treatment strategies used in this case 4. No its not appropriate, need to improve as mention in the optional comments 5. Need to revise the manuscript as per additional comment to make this manuscript scientifically correct. 6. For a case report at least the references should 10 to justify the case- see the optional comment 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limited Clinical Detail in Case Presentation: While the case mentions significant clinical features such as visual impairment, obesity, intellectual difficulties, and chronic renal failure, it lacks specific details regarding the onset, progression, and severity of each symptom. Including a more comprehensive clinical history and examination findings would provide a clearer picture of the patient's presentation and aid in understanding the disease course. 2. Lack of External Photos for Diagnosis Support: Bardet-Biedl syndrome is a multi-organ disorder with characteristic physical features such as polydactyly and obesity. Incorporating external photos showcasing these features would strengthen the diagnostic accuracy of the case report and provide visual context for readers. This addition would enhance the recognition of Bardet-Biedl syndrome in clinical practice. 3. Incomplete Description of Fundus Findings: Instead of simply stating "fundus showed bilateral retinitis pigmentosa," the report should provide a detailed description of the specific fundus findings observed in the patient. This could include characteristics such as bone spicule pigmentation, arteriolar attenuation, and optic disc pallor. A thorough description would aid in differentiating retinitis pigmentosa from other retinal dystrophies and provide valuable diagnostic information. 4. Insufficient Interpretation of OCT Findings: While the report mentions bilateral degenerative macular edema on OCT, it does not discuss the significance of these findings in the context of Bardet-Biedl syndrome. Providing an interpretation of OCT findings, such as their impact on visual function and disease prognosis, would enhance the clinical relevance of the case report and aid in treatment decision-making. 5. Limited Discussion of Differential Diagnosis: Bardet-Biedl syndrome shares clinical 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>features with other syndromic and non-syndromic retinal dystrophies. Including a discussion of the differential diagnosis and how specific clinical and genetic findings support the diagnosis of Bardet-Biedl syndrome would add depth to the case report and help clinicians consider alternative diagnoses in similar cases.</p> <p>6. Limited Treatment Discussion: While the report briefly mentions symptomatic and preventive treatments for BBS, it does not delve into specific interventions or their efficacy. A more thorough discussion of available treatments, ongoing research efforts, and emerging therapies would be beneficial for clinicians and researchers in the field.</p> <p>7. Insufficient Discussion of Complications: BBS is associated with various complications beyond those mentioned in the report, such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, and reproductive issues. Including a more comprehensive discussion of potential complications and their management would enhance the clinical relevance of the report.</p> <p>8. Incomplete References: While references are provided, some key points lack specific citations within the text. Ensuring that all statements are adequately supported by references would enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the report.</p> <p>9. Language and Formatting: There are minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in formatting throughout the manuscript. A thorough proofreading and adherence to journal-specific formatting guidelines would improve the overall professionalism of the report.</p> <p>Addressing these drawbacks would strengthen the scientific merit and clinical relevance of the case report on Bardet-Biedl syndrome and retinitis pigmentosa.</p>	
--	--	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suraj Kumar Chaurasiya
Department, University & Country	CL Gupta Eye Institute, India