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Reviewer’s report:

All in all, the report is much rounder now. However, there still are some minor language issues (such as "4 weeks later" in line 111).

When it comes to the management of the patient, I wonder about an early vitrectomy. There are several issues to consider. First, there was a 24 hours delay between the injury and the initial ocular assessment. Then, after the first B-mode echography, with dense vitreous opacities, vitrectomy was not performed. According to your report, the anterior chamber had been washed out (by the way, phrasal verbs should be avoided in this context). Though the efficacy of vitrectomy is not well established, the few reported cases recommend early vitrectomy when possible. There is, at least, one case with good visual outcome indexed in Medline: Lisa D. Kelly, Lance P. Steahly. Successful Prophylaxis of Clostridium perfringens Endophthalmitis. Arch Ophthalmol. 1991;109(9):1199. In this case, diagnosis and vitrectomy were performed within 8 hours of the initial injury. Final visual acuity was 20/25.

But early vitrectomy, though the best option, is not always feasible and its indication is a hard decision to make. It would be interesting to elaborate a little bit more on this.

Regarding the evisceration, bad previous personal experience with similar cases, and your later statement of using of a prothesis, led me to assume an evisceration had been made. Therefore, I asked for a misleading correction. However, I still think it would be interesting to state, as you did, that evisceration was considered but the patient declined since the infection had already been properly eradicated.
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