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Which of the 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 than 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.

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

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