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Reviewer’s report:

Case report very correctly highlights that whenever there is communication between vitreous cavity and posterior/anterior chamber, then a vitrectomy is indicated, even if it does not seem to prolapse at the time. With advancing age and indeed with intra-ocular interventions, vitreous liquefies and sequelae like the one illustrated, can occur.

There are no major revisions.

Discretionary revision:

Some discussion throwing light on the possible cause of dislocation (fellow eye had RD surgery, so was it myopia? In which case vitreous liquefaction is expected) would be appropriate.

There are several newer references (Fernández-Buenaga R et al, Werner L et al) wrt IOL-CB dislocation. Inclusion of these too, is warranted.

Minor essential revisions:

Overall, language can be improved. Few examples are listed below -

Line 78 and 68: Case history does not provide any cause for IOL-CB dislocation. Was it due to high myopia or PXF. What kind of RD did patient have in fellow eye; was it associated with high myopia

Line 76: Pre-AGV IOP unclear

Line 77: AGV implanted supero or infero nasally?

Line 84: ‘sutured’ should be replaced by ‘tied off’

Line 88: was vitreous seen blocking the tube

Line 89 and 119: ‘the tube was again moved to in front to the optic IOL’ can be revised as ‘the tube was repositioned in front of the optic of the IOL’

Line 90 and 120: ‘using a forceps tip’ can be replaced with ‘using the tip of a forceps’

Line 101: ‘vitreous incarceration in the tube was seen’ should be replaced with ‘incarceration of vitreous was seen in the tube’

Line 101: consider replacing ‘however’ as it is repetitive (line 99)
Line 117: 'then was performed' replace with 'was then performed'

Line 117, 118, 119: 'because during a simple vitrectomy the normal vitreous can be removed and does not require suturing of the sclerotomies' - language needs revision

Line 126: 'suggests' instead of 'suggested'

Legends and figures are confusing: they are labelled A, B and then A and B again together with 1, 2, 3 and 4

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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