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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors describe 2 cases of fungal endophthalmitis in which both patients had good outcomes related to treatment with caspofungin. They have now resubmitted their manuscript based on the comments of the previous reviewer. I was not the initial reviewer, and I have a number of concerns related to the manuscript that I will detail below. The manuscript would also require significant editorial revision to correct spelling and grammar (there are too many for me to indicate them in detail).

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. In the title of the manuscript and in the abstract, the authors indicate their successful treatment of 2 cases of fungal endophthalmitis with caspofungin. However, I would argue that both of their patients, at least initially, underwent IOL removal, local treatment with an antifungal agent, and even a short course of another systemic antifungal. I think it is difficult to know whether the success was totally related to treatment with caspofungin, or whether these other therapies even contributed more significantly to the good outcome. I would argue that in patients who develop postoperative fungal endophthalmitis, local therapy may be the most important approach. I would suggest modifying the title to take out the words 'with caspofungin' and modifying the abstract. The conclusions would also need to be changed. I don't think the contributions of the other therapies can be ignored.

2. The abstract should be shortened. There is no need to describe each of the cases in detail, but it should be a summary.

3. In the abstract and background, I would indicate that endophthalmitis is an intraocular infection caused primarily by bacteria or fungi. Parasites would be exceedingly rare and I would not mention them.

4. In the last paragraph under background, I think there is something missing the authors describe two cases in 'light of the literature.' Again, this does not make sense to me.

5. In the last line on page 3, the authors indicate that a total of 4 grams of amphotericin B were used. Was that 4 grams of amphotericin B or 4 grams of liposomal amphotericin B. Anyway, I would remove as I don't believe the total number of grams used is that relevant.

6. On page 5, the authors indicate that the dose of IV voriconazole was 200 mg/20 cc. That is not the systemic dose, which is usually a 6 mg/kg load, followed by 4 mg/kg every 12 hours.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. In the second line of the background, the authors indicate that endophthalmitis 'treats' the vision seriously. I don't believe that is what they mean.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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