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Reviewer’s report:

General

I have reviewed the revised manuscript by Ertugrul et al. The authors have responded to most of my suggested and I believe the manuscript is now acceptable for publication after a few minor revisions and comments:

1. The editorial office needs to carefully review the manuscript for a few spelling errors and stylistic changes. The spelling errors include the spelling of voriconazole in the abstract, amikacin on page 3, perioperatively on page 3, vitreous on page 4, gentamicin on page 4, and genito-urinary on page 5. I may have missed a few others.

2. On page 2 and page 5, the authors assess visual acuity by 'counter' finger at one meter and 'countering' finger.' What is the correct term? Is it 'counting'?

3. On the bottom of page 4, the dose of IV voriconazole is still listed at 200 mg/20cc. That cannot be correct. It has to be the exact dose administered IV. The per 20 cc part does not make sense. In the discussion, they say 4 mg/kg BID.

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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