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Which of the 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?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Dear Author,

Your article is very original and well described.

1. Some comments:
   --Introduction: Line 4: to write "on the contrary..." better than "contrary...". Line 6 to write "a" typical... better than "the" typical...
   --Case description: Line 2: to write 02 "on" the affected eye... better than "with"... Page 4 Line 7 to write "systemic extension have not been..." better than "haven't been..."
   --Discussion: Line 6: to write "in the choroidal tissue " better than "in the tissue of choroid" ...
2. It appears absolutely necessary to add the second RMI which shows (theoretically) the regression of retrobulbar lymphoid lesions also as well as choroidal and conjunctival lymphoid lesions. This important information is missing.

Congratulations and best wishes for the publication soon.
Sincerely
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