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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript describes 9 patients with acute retinal necrosis treated with oral antiviral agents instead of intravenous antiviral therapy which is currently the standard and accepted treatment of acute retinal necrosis. The results of the therapy are acceptable, but the manuscript needs more convincing evidence such as fundus photographs and clear explanations of the diagnoses.

Major compulsory revisions

1. The fundus photographs before and after treatment of at least one representative patient are required.

2. The third line in Methods section: ‘…who were treated solely with oral valaciclovir’ is not correct. While valaciclovir was the only antiviral treatment given, other medications such as prednisolone were also used in some patients.

3. Is ‘Valtre’ the correct spelling? It should be ‘Valtrex’.

4. In the Methods section, it is described that ‘In six out of nine cases, the clinical diagnosis was confirmed by demonstration of herpetic viral DNA in aqueous or vitreous samples by polymerase chain reaction (PCR)’. However, in the Results section, it is described that VZV was detected from two patients and HSV-2 was detected from one patient. Therefore a total of only three patients had PCR-proven herpetic viral infection. In fact, this data is also clearly tabulated in Table 1. If six patients were tested for herpetic virus by PCR, and three were PCR-positive while three were PCR-negative, then the authors should clearly state so in Methods and Results. In addition, disseminated herpes zoster infection and a history of recent chicken pox infection are not evidence that ocular findings were caused by VZV infection. Therefore, VZV was identified as the causative virus in two patients and was the presumptive cause in the other two patients. The authors should clarify these inconsistencies.

5. In many sentences, spaces between numerals and units are missing; e.g., 5mg/kg # 5 mg/kg

6. Which two patients in Table 1 were HIV-positive, and which patient had a history of chicken pox? The patient numbers of these patients should be written in the manuscript.

7. Table 1: It reads as if there are two patients #8, because patient descriptions such as age and sex are repeated for left and right eyes. In this case,
descriptions of each eye should be written separately, but descriptions of the patient should be given only once.
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