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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
- A brief mention of the patient's visual exam (acuity) on presentation and on last available follow-up is essential to the case description.
- A detailed description of the neurologic examination of the patient at last available follow-up is also essential as bifrontal injury of this nature is commonly associated with substantial neurologic sequelae.

Minor Essential Revisions:
- There is a punitive tone taken towards the physicians who removed the penetrating foreign body. On pages 2, 4, 6, the word "incautiously" is used to describe the action of removing the foreign body. On page 7, the work "imprudent" is used. It would be more professional to describe why the actions of the practitioners who removed the objects acted "incautiously" or in an "imprudent" manner rather than presenting their actions in a pejorative manner. I would simply recommend omitting the words "incautiously" and "imprudent" from the manuscript. I think the authors line "Patients in whom the penetrating object is left in place until surgical removal have a significantly lower mortality than those in whom the objects are inserted and then removed (26% versus 11% respectively) [16]." is completely adequate to get the point across that penetrating objects should be left in place until the patient is taken to the operating room. Also a sentence on why it is better to remove a foreign body in the OR would be helpful.
- On page 4, change "mushrooms" to fungi

Discretionary revisions:
none

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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