

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_129533
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case-Report on Double Seronegative Neuromyelitis Optica Spectrum Disorder (DN NMOSD)
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		This case report highlights the symptoms, diagnosis and treatment of DN NMOSD which could benefit health care professionals in assessing CNS conditions and provide patients with treatment which is true to the underlying condition. And also people could be benefited with knowledge on this topic for the challenges and confusions they are facing if they are diagnosed with this disease and to get a clear insight for improving their quality of life.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		Yes, It can be easily understood by many. More simple the title, the readers can easily access and review.
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.		Yes
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		Yes.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		Yes. Recent articles have been included
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		I have written in easy english which can be understood and benefit many students and peoples for what they search.

Review Form 3

Optional/General comments	<div>Review article</div> <div>A case report on double seronegative NMOSD</div> <div>Abstract</div> <p>Abbreviations should be removed from the abstract.</p> <p>The abstract describes the clinical case of a patient presenting with a central neurological picture and negative anti-NMO and anti-MOG antibodies. However, these are common clinical cases where both antibodies are negative. In addition, this case provides an opportunity to discuss these forms again, particularly in terms of evolution and treatment. They could perhaps suggest other CNS disorders not yet identified by their antibodies.</p> <p>Moreover, these two entities (NMOSD and MOGAD) are clearly differentiated today. This element seems to have been mixed up by the authors throughout the manuscript and deserves to be rewritten in this sense.</p> <div>INTRODUCTION</div> <p>Myoglobuline?? Re write please</p> <p>The last sentence is unclear and not very explicit (the patient who experienced ...); please modify it or make it more explicit.</p> <div>PRESENTATION OF CASE</div> <p>Please give the meaning of each abbreviation when it first appears in the text</p> <p>Specify the technique or method used to test for anti-NMO and anti-MOG antibodies.</p> <p>CV Doppler? Why? Which indication?</p> <p>Put in the MRI images?</p> <p>LFT? RFT? Signification?</p> <p>Have infectious causes been formally ruled out? Tuberculosis? Thoracic investigation?</p> <p>And a paraneoplastic cause, given the patient's age?</p> <p>Give a functional score? EDSS? Calculate visual acuity?</p> <p>The value of visual evoked potentials and OCT for diagnostic and prognostic purposes. Please give details of the results if they have been carried out on the patient.</p> <p>The diagnostic criteria proposed for MOGAD were not tested in this patient.</p> <div>DISCUSSION</div> <p>Correct</p>	<p>The changes and suggestions have been made in my revised version.</p> <p>Yet I don't have the MRI image of the patient since they were not provided the scan image alone. It was difficult to approach them after discharge.</p> <p>Abbreviations have been removed from the abstract.</p> <p>The abstract has been slightly modified.</p> <p>Spelling mistake has been corrected.</p> <p>Antibodies technique was specified.</p> <p>CV doppler indication has been explained.</p> <p>Lft, rft and other blood investigations have been signified.</p> <p>EDSS score was given.</p> <p>Visual acuity cannot be calculated.</p> <p>No other investigations was performed to the patient during the stay in hospital.</p>
----------------------------------	---	--

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)	No