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Ref: Good functional recovery following intervention for edelayed suprachoroidal haemorrhage post bleb needling: a case report.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your recent email concerning the cover letter for the re-submitted case report, please note the following amendments.

Referee 1: Nathan Radcliffe

Point 1: alteration to language used in the abstract and main body of the text

Author’s Response:

In the abstract introduction the changes are as shown

1. “recognised” instead of “commonly performed” in line 1.
2. “Suprachoroidal haemorrhage can occur as an unusual complication” instead of “Suprachoroidal haemorrhage is recognised as a rare complication of this procedure” in line 2.
3. “We report a pseudophakic patient who had good” instead of “We wish to present a patient with” in line 3.
5. “following early surgical intervention for this complication” instead of “after a suprachoroidal haemorrhage following a bleb needling” in line 5.

The case presentation in the abstract has been amended as follows

1. Line 1 has been rephrased as “A 79-year-old pseudophakic male with chronic open angle glaucoma presented with further deterioration of his right visual field despite maximum medical therapy and a previous trabeculectomy” instead of “A 79-year-old man with an intraocular lens implant; with open angle glaucoma; had further deterioration of his right visual field despite taking maximum medical therapy and a previous trabeculectomy”.
2. “(IOP)” was added to line 4.
3. “The patient had bleb needling using 5-fluouracil forming a diffuse bleb, postoperatively the intraocular pressure was 6mmHg” has been rephrased as “Bleb needling with 5-fluouracil was performed in a standard manner. His postoperative IOP was 6mmHg” in line 4.
4. “reduced to” was inserted in line 6.
5. “clinically he had two large choroidal detachments, which progressed into suprachoroidal haemorrhages” has been rephrased as “two large choroidal detachments where observed clinically, these progressed to suprachoroidal haemorrhages” in line 6.
6. “Surgery including a right chamber reformation, bleb compression suture and drainage of the haemorrhagic suprachoroidal detachments five days after the
initial needling was performed” has been rephrased as “Five days after the
initial needling, the patient had complex surgery involving anterior chamber
reformation, a bleb compression suture and drainage of the haemorrhagic
suprachoroidal detachments” in line 8.
8. travaprost and brinzolamide have lost their capital letters in line 12.
9. “The final” has replaced “His” in line 12.
10. “pre-suprachoroidal haemorrhage visual field” replaced “fields prior to this
event” in line 13.

In the main case presentation the introduction has had the following changes.
1. “unusual” instead of “rare” in line 3.
2. The numbers 1,2 have been superscripted in line 4.
3. “pseudophakic” has been inserted in line 5.
4. “on clopidrogl therapy who had a” was inserted in line 5.

Referee 1: Nathan Radcliffe
Point 2: request to specify findings on B-scan ultrasound
Author’s Response:
I have included a photograph of the B-scan ultrasound and listed the findings in the
text as follows with the rephrasing of the sentence “This was confirmed by
ultrasound, which showed that the posterior pole was attached with no evidence of
significant submacular haemorrhage” to “B-scan ultrasonography confirmed a dense
non-mobile echogenic shadow consist with a suprachoroidal haemorrhage. The
ultrasound also showed an attached posterior pole with no significant submacular
haemorrhage (Figure 1)”

Referee 1: Nathan Radcliffe
Point 3: Alter the discussion to incorporate frequency of suprachoroidal haemorrhage
post bleb needling with appropriate references
Author’s Response:
The discussion section has been altered as follows:
1. The first paragraph has been rewritten to include a reference from Mardelli as
advised by the reviewer.
2. The letter “a” has been deleted from line 5.
3. The words “B-scan ultrasonography” have replaced “ultrasound examination”.
4. The last paragraph has been rewritten to highlight the poor visual outcome
with treatment.

Referee 1: Nathan Radcliffe
Point 4: to tone down the language attributing the positive outcome of early surgical
intervention
Author’s Response:
The conclusion section was altered as shown
1. The paragraph was rewritten to suggest that early surgical intervention might be
beneficial as advised by the reviewer.

Referee 1: Nathan Radcliffe
Point 5: Minor points- alteration of language used use of semi-colons, capital letters
for generic drug names and awkward phrasing of sentences.
Author’s Response:
1. “male with chronic open angle glaucoma” inserted instead of “man” in line 1.
2. “right central” inserted in line 2.
3. “Brimonidine, Brinzolamide and Travoprost to the right eye. He had bilateral intraocular lens implants and developed open angle glaucoma requiring bilateral trabeculectomies 15 years previously” has been rephrased as “Fifteen years ago the patient had bilateral trabeculectomies and was currently requiring brimonidine, brinzolamide and travoprost to control the intraocular pressure (IOP). The patient was pseudophakic”.
4. “progression of the” has been rephrased as “progressive” in line 6.
5. “and the IOP was” is replaced by “with an IOP of” in line 10.
6. “and” inserted in line 10.
7. “complained of pain and vision in the right eye was reduced to hand movements temporally” is replaced with “re-attended with pain and a right visual acuity reduced to hand movements” in line 11.
8. “Examination revealed a formed anterior chamber and two large choroidal detachments” has been rephrased as “Clinically the patient had a formed anterior chamber and two large choroidal detachments” in line 12.
9. “the patient had a secondary suprachoroidal haemorrhage” has been rephrased as “the choroidal detachments had progressed to suprachoroidal haemorrhages” in line 14.
10. “The patient had a right chamber reformation, bleb compression suture and drainage of the haemorrhagic suprachoroidal detachments via long posterior sclerotomies performed five days after the initial needling” has been rephrased as “Five days after the initial needling the patient had complex surgery involving anterior chamber reformation, a bleb compression suture and drainage of the haemorrhagic suprachoroidal detachments via long posterior sclerotomies” in line 17.
11. “with substantial reduction in the choroidal detachment although some areas of detachment remained” has been rewritten as “Fundal examination showed a substantial reduction in the choroidal detachment with some persistent areas of detachment” in line 21.
12. “represented with increasing pain in the right eye and vision was perception to light” has been rewritten as “attended with a visual acuity of light perception and increased ocular pain” in line 23.
13. “a dense vitreous haemorrhage was noted, the retina appeared grossly attached and the kissing choroidals were reduced with peripheral choroidal detachments only” has been rephrased as “Examination revealed a dense vitreous haemorrhage. Ultrasound showed no retinal detachment and the peripheral choroidal detachments were reduced” in line 24.
14. “The compression suture was removed and the IOP reduced to 16mmHg” has been rewritten as “The IOP was 16mmHg on removing the compression suture” in line 26.
15. “the patient had a visual acuity of” has been rewritten as “the visual acuity was” in line 29.
16. “He was commenced on Travaprost and later Brinzolamide was added. His final visual acuity was 6/12 with an IOP of 13mmHg” has been rephrased as “The final visual acuity was 6/12 with an IOP of 13mmHg on travaprost and brinzolamide” in line 31.
17. “His” has been replaced by “The final” in line 34.
“little change when compared with the fields prior to the suprachoroidal haemorrhage (Figure 1)” has been rephrased as “only slight change when compared with the pre-suprachoroidal haemorrhage field (Figure 2)” in line 32.

Referee 2: Marlene Moster
Point 1: Minor points- language
Author’s Response:
Please see response to Referee 1, points 1, 4 and 5.

Also note the following changes:
In the title page the following changes have been made

1. Title altered to “Good functional recovery following intervention for delayed suprachoroidal haemorrhage post bleb needling: a case report”.
2. All titles and qualifications for the authors have been removed.
3. The affiliation of each author has been denoted by a superscript number and matches the institute below the list of authors.
4. The email of each author is recorded and denoted by the initials of the author.

The references section has been altered and Mardelli et al were inserted as reference 3, the remaining reference numbers have been amended.

The title of the “Contributions of the authors” has been renamed “Authors contribution”.

The word “informed” consent has been added to the consent section.

The figure legends have been altered to include the B-scan ultrasonography photograph.

We hope you find these amendments acceptable and in keeping with the reviewers’ comments.

Yours Sincerely,

Paul S Cannon