

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_124987
Title of the Manuscript:	A rare cases of endogenous endophthalmitis: diagnostic and therapeutic challenges
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article adds little to the literature; it is well-written, but essential flaws were found. The reference list is mistaken and talks badly	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is misspelling. These are prevalent cases in clinical practice, and I do not see the diagnosis or therapeutic challenge. The title should be changed to something like this. Two endogenous endophthalmitis cases accompanying nephrological condition in diabetic patients	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured, but timely and early intervention concepts should be used cautiously	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The clinical cases descriptions should be better outlined. Clinical case 1. More clinical background information is needed. Diabetic control quality, level AiC. Additional ultrasound findings should be mentioned. Please outline the doses, concentration, and number of intravitreally antibiotic injections that were used and explain why intravitreally corticosteroid or vitrectomy were not considered in this case. Was any PCR testing done to discard any other etiology?	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In clinical case 2, more background clinical information is needed, including the reason for undiagnosed DM and more detailed US findings of the acute event. The doses and number of intravitreal antibiotic injections should be better outlined. Mention the criteria for repeated intravitreal antibiotic injection and not for adding intravitreal injection to reduce intraocular inflammation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The discussion section should mention the Endophthalmitis Vitrectomy Study (EVS) guidelines and recent AAO and PubMed publication comments.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It needs improvements in grammar and some editing	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Dear Authors, the references included only deal with optic glioma, not endogenous endophthalmitis. Please, essential amendments are required. No plagiarism detected No competing interest were raised No ethical issues were raised	

Review Form 3

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:	Miguel A. Quiroz-Reyes
Department, University & Country	National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico