Reviewer’s report

Title: Two cases of perforated corneal ulcers complicating rheumatoid arthritis treated successfully by biological therapy

Version: 0 Date: 15 Aug 2019

Reviewer: Karen Schreiber

Reviewer's report:

This case report describes two cases of perforated corneal ulcers secondary to rheumatoid arthritis treated successfully by Rituximab and Infliximab. The cases are relevant, well presented and the discussion is well nuanced.

The authors conclude in their abstract: 'Our cases confirm the efficacy of Infliximab (case 1) and Rituximab (case 2) as a treatment of this severe and destructive keratolysis of the cornea complicating an active RA allowing to plan corneal graft. This good therapeutic response will contribute to increase literature reports of this therapy success.'

I recommend a more careful phrasing other than 'confirm', as these are case reports (and notably both patients also received IVMP). I suggest a more slightly more modest phrasing such as 'suggest' .. at the end of the day we will need RCTs to confirm this observation.

In row 2-3 in the discussion section I miss a little more information in which populations an eye involvement of 39% of RA patients has been found. It is certainly not my impression that 40% of our routine RA patients have eye involvement. Where these populations treated in tertiary centers only? And where in the world does this observation stem from?

Furthermore, I recommend that the authors include 2-3 sentences on discussing, once confirmed in adequately designed RCT, a financial aspect in that these biologics may not be available in many parts the world.
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