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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a pretty straight forward case report highlighting the devastation so radiation retinopathy and risk factors in patients who are diabetic. It is stated that there was no known ocular history but it requires stated that whether the patient was reviewed for diabetic screening and possible retinopathy to know whether there was any diabetic retinopathy or just that the patient had not presented to anyone and therefore fundal status prior to presentation had not been documented.

How long was the patient diabetic and hypertensive. Was BP controlled? What was smoking status?

Discussion is too dismissive. There is not enough detail on effect of hypertension or diabetes to elucidate real risk at population level. What is the incidence of any form of retinopathy?

Overall this case does highlight the risks, which are well known to radiotherapists and ophthalmologists. As such I find this low priority for publication. The important message is monitor visual function with early referral to prevent neovascularisation. It is less clear as to whether this alters the devastating macular ischaemia that can compromise vision.

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

It is stated that there was no known ocular history but it requires stated that whether the patient was reviewed for diabetic screening and possible retinopathy to know whether there was any diabetic retinopathy or just that the patient had not presented to anyone and therefore fundal status prior to presentation had not been documented.

How long was the patient diabetic and hypertensive. Was BP controlled? What was smoking status?

Discussion is too dismissive. There is not enough detail on effect of hypertension or diabetes to elucidate real risk.

Overall this case does highlight the risks, which are well known to radiotherapists and ophthalmologists. The important message is monitor visual function with early referral to prevent neovascularisation. It is less clear as to whether this alters the devastating macular ischaemia that can compromise vision, data on outcome in more detail from previous studies regarding this would be useful.

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?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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