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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

N/A - no methodology

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

N/A - no experiments or analyses

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

N/A - no results to interpret

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

 Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: Authors report a case of allergic contact dermatitis of both eyes caused by alcaftadine, a commonly used anti-histaminic. The case report is well report and images are well described. A few comments are given below:

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

My comments

Abstract: is well written. Please mention that oral steroids were used for treatment in the abstract as well.

Please mention the dose of oral steroids used and the way tapering was carried out. Was any topical steroid used?

Please mention how many months of follow up was available.

Please mention that the +1 positive result of the patch test in the case description and not in the discussion.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

As above

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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