

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_70592
Title of the Manuscript:	Bilateral orbital chloroma revealing acute myeloid leukemia: a 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>unfortunately, there are too many scientific errors from a hematological point of view. First of all, they need to be reviewed.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no classification as Type 2. If the FAB classification is meant, this should be clearly stated. In addition, since the current classification of AML is based on genetic characteristics, the patient's genetic profile (especially t(8,21)) must be specified. 2. D-blastine etc should be written with the molecule name. 3. The bone marrow blast rate cut-off for the diagnosis of AML is 20%. However, if the authors argue that it is 30%, they should cite the reference. <p>In addition, the 7th day after the treatment is a very short time for the follow-up of the patient. The patient's long-term outcomes should also be reported.</p> <p>The role of methotrexate and corticosteroid in the treatment of AML and chloroma should be explained in the discussion section.</p> <p>Although the article presents an interesting phenomenon, it is not suitable for publication as it is. Major revision is required.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Mehmet Can Ugur
Department, University & Country	Bozyaka Education and Training Hospital, Turkey