

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_87209
Title of the Manuscript:	Central Retinal Vein Occlusion Secondary to Paroxysmal Nocturnal Hemoglobinuria
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.journalor.com/index.php/OR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>1. The case report only report the patient condition cannot have the conclusion of the discussion in the abstract.</p> <p>Case report:</p> <p>2. Figure 1 show right eye optic disc, but the patient is left eye have problem. The figure of left eye optic disc before treatment is necessary. The figure of left eye should be showed with arrow point out the lesion. Whether there are have angiography of the left eye to confirm central retinal vein occlusion?</p> <p>3. Need more evidence to confirm left central vein occlusion.</p> <p>4. More information about the clinical course and management of left central retinal occlusion is necessary.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>5. In discussion, author should discuss the difference among this patients and the patients in other reports about the same disease and have vein occlusion, not only review the pathophysiology of Paroxysmal nocturnal hemoglobinuria.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>6. The manuscript only report a 25 years old men, he discontinued Eculizumab and then left eye central retinal vein occlusion, from the information we cannot have the conclusion in the manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Abbreviation (PIGA) should be definition in the first presentation.</p> <p>Case report: In line 3, the patient is a men "she suddenly noted" is not correct.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Cheung-Ter Ong</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chung Jen Junior College of Nursing, Taiwan</b>