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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

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?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Fernandez and collaborators are reporting six cases of valsalva retinopathy, most of them were treated with vitrectomy. And it is very interesting mostly for dense premacular hemorrhage cases. The cases are well structured and the pictures are very elucidative, but the English should be revised. There is one thing that could be included in the introduction and it is: the reason to report those cases. What do they add to the literature? Is it because 5 cases were treated with vitrectomy and because of the sub-ILM hemorrhage? In the case presentation, it is quite difficult to visualize the precursors because there are too many parentheses there. Maybe, it could be easier just to put the reference for the Table. Another point to consider is: it is not clear why the other three patients underwent vitrectomy without trying N:YAG treatment first. Finally, there is a paper attached to this review that maybe be added in the references.
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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