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Reviewer's report:

Dr. Guo reported diagnosing a very rare case of a subretinal lesion caused by echinococcosis in a patient with severe panuveitis. This report is very important for ophthalmologists working in rural areas, especially those who regularly treat patients employed in agriculture and animal husbandry, as these patients are susceptible to parasitic infection. Unfortunately, the present version of the manuscript did not provide enough support to justify the diagnosis and treatment. The author should respond to the following comments.

1. The author should explain why both steroid and anti-VEGF treatments were used. Severe inflammation sometimes obscures vessel dilation in the iris, and this can resemble iris neovascularization (i.e., pseudo neovascularization). This pseudo neovascularization can be resolved with anti-inflammation treatments, such as oral steroids. Did the author perform angiography in this patient? Furthermore, if the author suspected infectious uveitis, why was steroid injection into the vitreous fluid performed? This method would have worsened the clinical status of a patient suffering from infectious uveitis.

2. The authors should explain why vitrectomy was performed. Was the primary aim to obtain a biopsy?

3. The author stated that the histological image was of the lesion after extraction from the ocular tissue. Does the hyaline material have a special role in echinococcosis infection? Please explain.

End of comments
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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