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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/</u> Benefits for Reviewers: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers</u>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	A
		n n v
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		

Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)

Review Form 3

Optional/General comments	Review article
	A case report on double seronegative NMOSD
	Abstract
	Abbreviations should be removed from the abstract.
	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.
	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.
	INTRODUCTION
	Myoglobuline?? Re write please
	The last sentence is unclear and not very explicit (the patient who experienced); please modify it or make it more explicit.
	PRESENTATION OF CASE
	Please give the meaning of each abbreviation when it first appears in the text
	Specify the technique or method used to test for anti-NMO and anti-MOG antibodies.
	CV Doppler? Why? Which indication?
	Put in the MRI images?
	LFT? RFT? Signification?
	Have infectious causes been formally ruled out? Tuberculosis? Thoracic investigation?
	And a paraneoplastic cause, given the patient's age?
	Give a functional score? EDSS? Calculate visual acuity?
	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.
	The diagnostic criteria proposed for MOGAD were not tested in this patient.
	DISCUSSION
	Correct

<u>PART 2:</u>

		Author's comment (if agreed with reviewe part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Islam Kediha
Department, University & Country	Benyoucef Benkhedda University Alger 1, Algeria

wer, correct the manuscript and highlight that at authors should write his/her feedback here)