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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting case which is worthy of publication, though a few revisions are needed

Minor Essential
1) The English grammar needs to be improved
2) The text refers to Figure 1a, but there only appears to be a Figure 1
3) The authors state ‘Management of VAD to prevent further embolic stroke is done on a case by case basis’ and refer to Menon et al. The study was actually a systematic review and meta-analysis which concluded that there ‘is no data to support the therapeutic superiority of anticoagulants over antiplatelet agents’. The authors should ensure that what they say reflects the references they quote.

Discretionary revisions
4) It would be nice to know what clinical tests and investigations were done in the four months prior to the patient seeing a neuro-ophthalmologist eg were visual fields done and had there been any other neuro-imaging?
5) The patient was started on anticoagulants rather than an antiplatelet. It would be interesting to know why the authors did this in view of the potential side-effects of anticoagulants as the meta-analysis by Menon et al they quote concludes that there ‘is no data to support the therapeutic superiority of anticoagulants over antiplatelet agents’ and the authors acknowledge this.
6) The reference by Ansari et al is actually a review article and it would be better if the original reference which Ansari et al quote was used

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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