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Author's response to reviews: see over
Reviewer 1: Publication of this case would not add anything new to the literature of choroidal metastases as has been described by the work of Ferry and Font or the Shields group. It is furthermore unclear how a patient followed only for three months could be said to have had a "good response to chemotherapy alone."

Reply: Respected sir, the patient now has received six cycles of chemotherapy and is on follow-up for past seven months. The improvement in visual acuity of his right eye currently is 20/60. This has saved him from radiation to his vital structures close to eye.

Reviewer 2:
1. It is non-small cell lung cancer and not non-small cell carcinoma lung (apart from the grammatical error... the term non-small cell is not applied to cancer from any other organ site ) - title

Reply: Respected Sir, the correction in the title has been made.

2. The manuscript needs significant editing to improve the grammar and to correct the spelling mistakes. Scant attention has been paid to the normal rules of punctuation. Inappropriate use of capitalizations is seen throughout the manuscript.

Reply: Sir, re-editing of the article has been done.

3. Abstract should be concise and not repetitive. The introduction for abstract is too long. Gemcitabine should not be capitalized in the middle of a sentence.

Reply: Sir, the introduction for abstract has been edited. Other correction pointed has been made.

4. The authors should not overplay the conclusions from one patient (see the last few lines of abstract)

Reply: Sir, the conclusion has been changed to- Treatment of choroidal metastasis has been done in past with radiotherapy alone or in combination with chemotherapy. This patient responded well after chemotherapy alone and had shown marked improvement after each chemotherapy. Thus chemotherapy alone can be a viable option as modality of treatment in choroidal metastasis if the primary tumor is chemo-responsive, and thus prevent acute radiation damage and its sequelae to vital structures close to eye during and after radiotherapy.

5. Introduction- The sentence beginning with “Primary sites for choroidal met..... is poorly constructed and needs to be rewritten.

Reply: Sir the corrections have been made.
6. It is important to first describe the history followed by physical examination and then laboratory work (serological, radiological and pathological) in order. The case report should include treatment, response evaluation and outcomes data as well. Here, the case presentation stops abruptly with results from ultrasound examination. The case description should be rewritten.

Reply: Sir, the case description has been re-written as advised.

7. The sentence beginning with “The patient was planned (!!!!) and administered........” needs to be rewritten to provide some clarity. Moreover, this part of the write up should be included in case presentation.

Reply: Sir, this part has been corrected and included in case presentation.

8. The discussion regarding the source of choroid metastasis is very repetitive (three times)

Reply: Sir, the repetitions are removed as advised

Needs some language corrections before being published. Sir, the language corrections has been made.