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Reviewer's report:

The reviewers have addressed the majority of my concerns. It is an interesting case that highlights the potential reversibility of tamoxifen toxicity. This is likely due to the relatively low dose the patient had taken. I understand that the authors are hypothesizing that tamoxifen toxicity shares similar pathologic features of MacTel2 and that they potentially share common pathophysiology. While the phenotypes may be similar it is still unclear whether or not the underlying mechanisms are the same. Are the authors suggesting that the etiology of MacTel2 is due to the RPE? Please clarify the following points in the text, and clearly state in the text:

1. If the authors believe that tamoxifen toxicity is due to damage to the RPE. Do they also believe that MacTel2 is due to RPE dysfunction as well? This contrasts with the belief that MacTel2 is Muller cell mediated. Please explain this conflicting points of view in the text.

2. Do the authors believe that tamoxifen is directly effecting Muller cells?

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

Yes

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.

Yes

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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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal