



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57076

Title: Rhino-orbito-cerebral mucormycosis with fulminant ophthalmologic involvement in an immunocompromised patient: a fatal case report

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Focuses on a rare and life threatening clinical condition
- Clear and detailed case presentation with chronological findings
- Good correlation of clinical, radiological, and laboratory findings
- Use of MRI and CT findings supports diagnosis
- Management approach including medical and surgical treatment is well described
- Clinical images on pages 4 and 5 enhance understanding
- Relevant discussion supported by literature

Weakness of the study

- Single case report limits generalizability
- No clear mention of ethical clearance or patient consent
- Discussion is brief and lacks deeper comparison with similar cases
- Some grammatical and formatting issues present
- Limited detail on differential diagnosis
- No detailed explanation of decision making for management steps
- Conclusion is very short and general

Reviewers Comments

The manuscript presents a clinically important and rare case of rhino orbito cerebral mucormycosis in an immunocompromised patient, which is highly relevant in current clinical practice. The case is well described with clear clinical findings, and the imaging details, such as MRI findings showing optic nerve involvement on page 4, add strength to the diagnosis. The inclusion of clinical photographs on page 5 also improves understanding of disease severity. However, ethical clearance and patient consent are not clearly mentioned and should be included as per standard publication requirements. The language is generally understandable, but there are minor grammatical errors and formatting issues that need correction. The discussion is relevant but somewhat brief and could be improved by including more comparison with previously reported cases and deeper clinical insights. The study is limited by being a single case report and this should be clearly acknowledged. Overall, the paper is clinically useful but requires some improvement in reporting and presentation.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT