



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79721

Title: Diagnosis of tuberculous uveitis by macrogenome of intraocular fluid: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05347189

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Surgeon

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: India

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-29 17:21

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-08 17:37

Review time: 10 Days

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Please rewrite the title in a more specific manner. Key Words: Please rewrite ‘Metagenomic sequencing; Xpert test for tuberculosis’ as ‘metagenomic next-generation sequencing; Xpert’ in the Key Words list and add more relevant keywords if any.

Abstract: Do the authors mean ‘Metagenomic next-generation sequencing (mNGS)’ by ‘tested for intraocular infection by second-generation gene’?

Case Presentation: Chief Complaints

1. Please revise as ‘occasional dry cough’ instead of mentioning cough twice.
2. Cephalosporin is not an anti-inflammatory treatment, please revise appropriately.
3. Please use ‘days’ instead of ‘d’.

Physical examination upon admission

1. Please rewrite the paragraph in a more systematic and scientific manner.

Laboratory examinations

1. Please mention whether Xpert was carried out for IO fluid or any other sample.

Final diagnosis

1. Please use same terminology for gene test throughout the article (e.g. mNGS).
2. It’s Brain MRI, not Head MRI.
3. Please rewrite the systemic diagnosis without numbering.
4. Please clarify and rewrite the sentence ‘Through a variety of molecular biological detection means, the etiological diagnosis is clear’.
5. Differential diagnosis should come before final diagnosis. Please note these are the differentials of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Granulomatous Uveitis. Treatment 1. Please use 'day' instead of 'd'. 2. Please clarify regarding the drugs 'pralprofen eye drops and compound topicamide eye drops' and also regarding the phrase '3 times/bedtime'. Outcome and Follow-up 1. Please note it's known as 'anterior chamber reaction and vitreous haze', not 'opacity'. 2. There are separate grading systems available for AC Cells and Flare and Vitreous Haze. Thus, rewrite the paragraph accordingly. Discussion: 1. It's not clear from the study whether Xpert was used for only sputum and placental tissue or was used for IO fluid also, along with mNGS. 2. Rather than mentioning IO fluid, please clearly mention whether it's Vitreous Humor or Aqueous Humor throughout the article. 3. Please clarify what it means by 'single case report with a small number of samples'. Figures: 1. Please clarify what the numbers (e.g. 8-1) signify. 2. In Figure 3, please describe all the findings clearly in a standardized manner. 3. Please clarify what is suetoid KP. Other Comments: 1. The authors have mentioned about the use of multimodal ophthalmic imaging in this case. However, use of multimodal imaging is not found for this case in the article. If used, please provide the relevant information. 2. Ophthalmological examination part is grossly deficient in the article. 3. The authors need to use more scientific terminologies as appropriate throughout the article. 4. Grammatical and sentence construction errors needs to be rectified appropriately throughout the article.