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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected association between diseases or symptoms

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?: Yes

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?: No

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Garg et al. have presented a case of interest with eosinophilic mucin rhinosinusitis and left eye visual loss. However, I have several concerns about this article.

1- In the case presentation the authors stated
   "history of unilateral left-sided altitudinal visual loss associated"
   "On admission, her visual acuity was limited to perception of light"
   This part need more description as for describing the pattern of visual field loss by patient a vision more than LP in needed.

2- Can authors provide the details of CBC?

3- Did they perform any Visual evoked potential test?
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