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Comments to authors:

This manuscript deals with a case study of a male patient who sustained a high-voltage electrical shock 3 months prior to development of bilateral impending macular holes.

I agree this is a rare case that has never been reported previously, and as such would warrant publication in the Journal of Medical Case Reports. However, the manuscript requires some attention to detail prior to being acceptable for publication. I have indicated the main problems below.

General
The English is understandable, but could be improved in general.
I believe the journal prefers US English spelling, and hence the present mixed
spelling is not acceptable. Thus while US spelling is used for “meter” and “color”,
UK spelling is used for “oedema” and “haemorrhages”.

I see no real reason for any (except one) of the abbreviations given and used, as
they are not used often enough (4 or 5 times?) to justify inclusion (eg. ICU, IOP,
KP, RPE, TA, DC, AC…). Only “SD-OCT” is justified.

Please note that numbers and their units (eg, “2 mg”) should be separated by a
space (ie, not “2mg”), throughout the manuscript.

The whole manuscript is under-referenced generally, with many statements not
supported by relevant references (see below).

Abstract
Page 2, line 2: Introduction: please correct “To our best knowledge” to “To the
best of our knowledge”.

Page 2, lines 4-7: Case presentation: this first sentence is too long. Please edit it
for length and clarity.

Page 2, line 12: Conclusion section: Please correct “aimed to aid” to “aimed at
aiding”.

Introduction
Line 1: Please supply the reference for “St. Yves in 1722”, as this is not in the
Reference list.

Lines 2-5: Please supply a reference.

Line 7: “oedema”: please use US spelling consistently throughout: “edema”.

Line 8: Please remove “etc”.

Line 8: Again, please correct “To our best knowledge” with “To the best of our
knowledge”.

Line 11: Please replace “and intend to highlight” with “we highlight”.

Lines 11-12: “and intend to highlight the effectiveness of the surgical treatment.”
It remains difficult to highlight the full effectiveness here as there is indeed very
little follow-up provided…? It appears effective in the short term (at one week
after surgery).

Case presentation
This is given as a single paragraph. Please try to divide the text into paragraphs
according to content.

Please note that in Figure 2, panels a and c are never mentioned in the main
text. Please include a reference to these panels in the main text or remove the
panels from the Figure.

Page 4, Line 16: Please replace “well-defined “cuff” around macula” with a
“well-defined “cuff” at the macula”.

Line 17: Please replace “a disruption between the retinal layers of the fovea” with
“a disruption of the retinal layers at the fovea”.
Line 24: Please replace “retinal tear” with “macular hole”.

Discussion
Again, the paragraph use (and lack thereof) leaves much to be desired here.
Page 5, lines 6-15: None of this is referenced at all. Please supply the relevant references to support all of these statements.
Page 5: lines 19-20: “forming a High-voltage wire-Air-Human body-Earth current loop”. Please remove this random capitalization (note also, “earth” refers to an electrical earth, and not the Earth).
Page 6, line 10: “2) the RPE is thicker and more tightly packed in submacular than in any other region of the eye, thus accumulating more thermal energy and heat leading to a damage of the macula”. Please supply a reference to support this statement.

Conclusions
“aimed to” again (see above).
“and the surgery proves to be effective in restoring the normal macular structure.”
Maybe more accurately said as “in the short-term, the surgery…”, or something similar.

References
The formatting of the references appears to have little to do with the format given in the authors’ instructions…? Please format the references as requested by the journal and as clearly given in the authors’ instructions.

Figures
Figure 1: “macular circular lesions(so called cuffs) are visible”. Maybe this could be indicated in the Figure with an arrow or two…?
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