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Which of the 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?: No

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:

This is an interesting RP case with recurrent macular hole. The result implicates disease mechanism and is worthwhile to be published. However, English should be polished to improve the overall manuscript readable. For the RP diagnosis, more clinical evidences, e.g., ERG, perimetry, should be provided in the report.

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