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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your kind consideration of our manuscript, entitled “Long-term progressive deterioration of visual function after papilledema improved by embolization of a dural arteriovenous fistula in the sigmoid sinus: a case report.” We have read the reviewers’ comments carefully and revised the manuscript with Tracked Changes accordingly. We are grateful to you and to the reviewers, as our manuscript is much improved. Our point-by-point responses are included in each PDF file. We hope that these revisions have addressed your comments adequately.

Sincerely yours,

Masahiro Zako M.D.
Department of Ophthalmology
Aichi Medical University
Nagakute, Aichi 480-1195, Japan

Tel: +81-52-264-4811 (ext. 2181)
Fax: +81-561-63-7255
E-mail: zako@aichi-med-u.ac.jp
Reviewer's report

Title: Long-term progressive deterioration of visual function after papilledema improved by embolization of a dural arteriovenous fistula in the sigmoid sinus: a case report

Version: 2 Date: 17 August 2014 Reviewer: Elizabeth Golesic

Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: New associations or variations in disease processes

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?: No

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?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

What I do not understand is how you claim the patient's vision improved after treatment for the DAVF, but you give an acuity of 0.8 and 0.3 after treatment, which is worse then the initial presentation? To me it seems like the patient presented with normal vision and papilledema, and then nearly three months later, when the cause was finally treated, the vision stayed low and continued to get lower over the following years.

Thank you for your comment. I agree with your suggestion. We revised the Abstract and Introduction appropriately.

Again, I don't think it has been addressed how long papilledema can exist before permanent damage occurs. Has anything been reported on that?

Thank you for your question. We looked up how long papilledema can exist before permanent damage occurs in many publications, but no description about it was found. We revised the Introduction.

Of merit is perhaps the fact the patient's vision continued to decline over the next 4 year, despite no recurrence of the papilledema.

Thank you for your comment. It is entirely what we want to argue in this case report.
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Reviewer's report
Title: Long-term progressive deterioration of visual function after papilledema improved by embolization of a dural arteriovenous fistula in the sigmoid sinus: a case report
Version: 2 Date: 9 August 2014
Reviewer: Eddie Liu

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?: No
Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No
Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:
Dear authors,
This manuscript has much improved since the last edition. Well done.
Page 7 line 16 to page 8 line 2: Please consider clarifying the following sentence: “it is unclear if our patient still has a cause for papilledema”. Do you mean it is unclear if there was a cause for his papilledema (page 8 line 11-12 suggest DAVF was the cause pf papilledema) or it is unclear if he has a persistent/recurrent cause for papilledema? If the latter is true, please comment on if the patient was investigated further for increased intracranial pressure after DAVF treatment.
This is an important paragraph. It suggests that recurrent papilledema does not develop in atrophic axons, but fails to explain the link to the patient in the case report. The following is a potential relationship between the two: since the patient showed progressive decrease in BCVA and concurrent complete disc paling (page 5 line 15-16), the patient may have suffered damage to his optic nerve axons (is there any evidence of this?), thus making recurrent increase in intracranial pressure difficult to detect? So undetected recurrent increase in intracranial pressure may have caused his deterioration in visual function?
Please expand on this paragraph.

I am grateful for your suggestion. We revised the sentence not to lead misunderstanding. A cause for papilledema in our patient disappeared by the appropriate transarterial and transvenous embolization therapy as described in Case presentation.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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