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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper is a case report and review of the literature on compressed air injuries around the eye.

The authors report one case and found 14 other cases in the literature. The authors claim that their case was the first case in which the air entered through an eyelid laceration and not the conjunctiva. The authors focus on the symptoms, findings and outcome. Although they examined whether the trauma was occupational or associated to hobbies in the reported cases and list the pressure of the air jet, they do not report which tool was responsible for the injury. This is of more interest than the symptoms and findings because it would help in advising preventive measures e.g. a longer pipe on the tool. The case has some educational value.

- **Major Compulsory Revisions**
  1. In the abstract the authors offers less than two lines on their own case. They should start the text with their own case describing it in more detail, and then summarize the literature.
  2. The abstract can be shortened with 25%
  3. Details about the tool responsible for the trauma should be given when possible.
  4. The authors should indicate how they identified the 14 cases in the literature (e.g. PubMed and search terms). There are probably more cases in the literature; I quickly found these two additional reports: (Bilateral orbital emphysema from compressed air injury. Li T, Mafee MF, Edward DP. Am J Ophthalmol. 1999 Jul;128(1):103-4. and [Accident with compressed air leading to orbital emphysema and pneumocephalus]. Willenborg KM, Bartling S, Kapapa T, Lenarz T, Stöver T. Laryngorhinootologie. 2006 Mar;85(3):201-3. German. No abstract available.
  5. I am not sure if BMC Ophthalmology uses pounds per square inch (PSI). Usually the SI Unit pascal (Newton per square metre, N/m²) is favoured.

- **Minor Essential Revisions**
  6. P2 L13-14 “However, no…movements” discard
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