

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122190
Title of the Manuscript:	Fulminant Guillain Barre Syndrome AMSAN variant involving posterior ciliary nerve mimicking brain death – A lesson in persistence
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.	on the scientific side, one positive point is the perseverance with which this type of patient is treated. the author presented a form of fulminant Guillain-Barré syndrome with bilateral mydriasis mimicking brain death and scientific publications are rare, let's hope for other future publications	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	the title to be corrected as follows:Fulminant Guillain Barre Syndrome AMSAN variantmimicking brain death – A lesson in persistence	
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 summary itself provides a good summary of the clinical situation	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	the manuscript is well structured, with observation and discussion small correction in the differential diagnosis the patient presented with hyponatraemia on admission and her kalaemia was correct (hypokalaemia should be ruled out as it manifested itself during the stay as one of the complications of hyponatraemia) on the other hand, and I think that the diagnosis of fisher miller should be mentioned in the diagnostic hypotheses, especially as the paralysis was descending and not ascending, with initial eye problems.	
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.	this manuscript relates a real-life clinical observation with an additional scientific contribution for the scientific and research community, especially as severe or fulminant Guillain-Barré syndrome is a very rare entity with several aetiologies, in particular digestive and viral infections, The cause of neuronal damage is molecular mimicry between C. jejuni lipo-oligosaccharides (LOS) and human gangliosides. whereas the outcome of fulminant GB is fatal, as reported in a few scientific publications. the authors stressed the need not to lose hope and to persevere with treatment	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	the bibliography is recent with 2/3 less than 10 years, especially as the fulminant nature of Guillain-Barré syndrome is not yet well developed in the literature, in particular the ocular involvement with mydriasis which mimics brain death.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think that the quality of the scientific English is correct. As a reviewer myself, I have a poor grasp of the English language, so I can't really judge this form, but I apologise profusely.	
Optional/General comments	the authors have respected the structure of the manuscript, perhaps consider a short title the clinical observation is correct, other diagnostic hypotheses of GBS need to be established before the patient falls into a deep coma and moves on to the fulminant phase. the discussion is well defined the conclusion is a little timid the bibliographical references are well introduced in the text	

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:	Batouche Djamil-Djahida
Department, University & Country	Algeria