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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: New associations or variations in disease processes

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Very interesting case. Thank you for the opportunity to review your case report. I would suggest the following minor revisions:

1. In your abstract and your conclusion, you use the word recognising which should be recognizing.
2. In your discussion, you mention the mucin samples and in this sentence, "eosiohilic debris" should say eosinophilic debris.
3. In your discussion, the word centred should be centered and the word ischaemic should be ischemic.
4. In this sentence: "Treatment has been centred primarily on surgical decompression of the optic nerve [5] though steroid therapy..." I think there should be a comma after optic
nerve.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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