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Dear Editor,

Purtscher-like retinopathy following valsalva manoeuvre effect: Case report

Response to Reviewer 1

1. Comment
Some spelling mistakes: Abstract second line present - (presence)

Response
We apologize for this error. We have made the amendment to the abstract as follow.

(abstract: line 2)
The characteristic fundus finding is presence of multiple Purtscher flecken.

2. Comment
Need to be consistent in tenses.

Response
We apologize for this error. We have made the amendment to the manuscript.

3. Comment
Missing (he): history and examination second line ....which (he)...; 3rd line ...(and) withholding his breath...

Response
We apologize for this error. We have made the amendment to the manuscript (history and examination).

(history and examination: paragraph 1, line 2-3)
A 43-year old Malay man presented with a history of sudden onset blurring of vision which was described as central foggy vision after catching a piece of falling plywood. He fell on the ground on his buttock while his left hand was still holding the plywood and holding his breath for about 2 minutes duration.

Response to Reviewer 2

1. Comment
History & examination- paragraph 2. Fundus finding noted that there was peripallial edema with dot & blot hemorrhages. However, this is not evident in your figure 2. We know that mild changes in the fundus may not be captured but you have to qualify it in your Figure 2 legend.
Response
We agree with the comment. We have described the changes more specific and we have added the comment on the right eye in the legend Figure 2.

(history and examination: paragraph 2, line 3)
The right eye fundus showed mild temporal peripapillary oedema associated with few dot and blot haemorrhages.

(legend Figure 2)
**Figure 2:** Left fundus (right photo) showed multiple variables size of cotton wool spots at posterior pole and right fundus (left photo) showed mild temporal peripapillary oedema at presentation

2. Comment
Discussion – paragraph 5. What is the rationale of giving indomethacin? You did not mention any literature review on the role and success of giving it.

Response
We agree with the comment. We have added the literature review and the role of giving indomethacin.

(discussion: paragraph 5, line 6)
Indomethacin showed improvement of visual acuity in chronic cystoids macular edema post cataract operation [11]. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) act as cyclooxygenase inhibitors and thus reduce the formation of endogenous prostaglandins.

3. Comment
Discussion – paragraph 6. You mention that the pts visual outcome normalized but in your Case Presentation, his vision after 6 weeks was 6/12??

Response
We apologize for this error. We have made the correction as follow:

(discussion: paragraph 6, line 6)
His visual outcome was improved to 6/12 at 6 weeks follow up.

4. Comment
Legends – no comment was made on the right eye in legend 2 & 3

Response
We have added the comment on the right eye in the legend Figure 2 & 3.
Figure 2: Left fundus (right photo) showed multiple variables size of cotton wool spots at posterior pole and right fundus (left photo) showed mild temporal peripapillary oedema at presentation.

Figure 3: Left fundus (right photo) showed resolving cotton wool spots and right fundus showed resolved temporal peripapillary oedema at 6 weeks follow-up.

5. Comment
Minor issues not for publication. Attached is the report with correction in style and English.

Response
We thank the reviewer for the report with correction in style and English. We have made the amendment to the manuscript accordingly.
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