

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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The report's focus on nephrological etiology and the multidisciplinary approach in managing the condition of endogenous endophthalmitis is valuable for clinicians dealing with similar systemic infections.</p> <p>I appreciate the detailed case presentations, which provide insights into different outcomes based on the timing of interventions and patient health.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Although the abstract effectively summarizes the key points of the manuscript but including a brief statement on the significance of nephrological complications in such cases would enhance its comprehensiveness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is well-organized, with clear divisions into sections. However, adding a "Methods" section to outline the diagnostic and therapeutic protocols used in both cases would add clarity for future replication in clinical practice.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references are mostly recent and relevant.</p> <p>However, adding references on the specific role of nephrological complications in the development of endogenous endophthalmitis would further strengthen the discussion.</p> <p>Additionally, some of the references appear to be focused on optic nerve gliomas, which seem unrelated to this case report. These should be reviewed for accuracy.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>There are no significant ethical issues in the manuscript</p>	

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pragati Garg
Department, University & Country	All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India