

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_90181
Title of the Manuscript:	Neovascular Glaucoma Secondary to Bloch-Sulzberger Syndrome Documented by Retinography and Wide Field Angiography: Case report
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The title should be changed as the purpose of this study is not to describe neovascular glaucoma but Bloch-Sulzberger Syndrome. If authors want to include neovascular glaucoma, the mechanism should be described. The case description should include the results of the treatment, despite the poor prognosis and how do they know that her condition has stabilized. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decide whether to use case report or case study. Consider reviewing manuscript and correct grammatical errors. Should not use acronyms until they have been named and explained earlier. (PI, IP, EO) The terms PI and IP are not the same, but sometimes in the text they are, so I recommend checking this issue. Omit duplicated images (Fig. 4 and 5 and their descriptions are the same) I suggest using the same font for the whole article. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This study needs revision before it can be published. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jenny Kam Lin Ku Lozano
Department, University & Country	Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru