

**Reviewer#1**

**Specific comments:** There are many things to be improved. Please see the attached file.

**1 Title.** Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript?

No. I suggest the title can be changed to "Combined hamartoma of the retina and retinal pigment epithelium (CHRRPE): A case report."

The title of the article has been revised to "Combined hamartoma of the retina and retinal pigment epithelium (CHRRPE): A case report." according to the comments.

**2 Abstract.** Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?

The abstract should be re-arranged because the conclusion is not suitable for this case report.

The abstract has been rearranged according to the core content of the article.

**3 Key words.** Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript?

Yes.

**4 Background.** Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study?

No. This case report is a case related to differential diagnosis. However, despite ocular toxoplasmosis, there are other D/Ds should be listed.

The results of laboratory examination were added, and the differential diagnosis section briefly described uveitis and ocular toxoplasmosis.

**5 Methods.** Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail?

Yes.

**6 Results.** Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study?

What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?

I suggest the authors to mention more about the followings:

1) Patient's previous medical history. Though his medical history was unremarkable,

authors should tell the readers about his contact history with other animals, sex history, travel history...etc. to help differentiate the final diagnosis.

[Added to History of past illness as requested.](#)

- 2) Laboratory data was not presented. If ocular toxoplasmosis was under suspicion, patient should have been tested for some common uveitis titers.

[Laboratory test results have been added.](#)

- 3) Treatment of ocular toxoplasmosis and CHRRPE differ. I suggest the authors to add some more information about this 2 different treatment strategy to readers.

[This article mainly focuses on the diagnosis of disease, so it does not specifically talk about treatment.](#)

**7 Discussion.** Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

Once again, if the patient was under some other diagnosis of infection/inflammation diseases, please tell the readers about the importance of blood tests survey.

[In this paper, the final diagnosis was CHRRPE and inflammatory disease was excluded. The laboratory results have been detailed in the Laboratory examinations.](#)

**8 Illustrations and tables.** Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks *etc.*, better legends?

I suggest the authors to create a small table to illustrate the clinical presentation of ocular toxoplasmosis and CHRRPE.

[The title of the article has been changed to "Combined hamartoma of the retina and retinal pigment epithelium \(CHRRPE\): A case report.", so the content is not focused on differential diagnosis, but just a brief overview.](#)

**9 Biostatistics.** Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

Not applicable in this case report.

**10 Units.** Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?

Yes.

**11 References.** Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references?

Please cite some other references:

- 1: Garweg JG. Ocular Toxoplasmosis: an Update. *Klin Monbl Augenheilkd*. 2016 Apr;233(4):534-9. English. doi: 10.1055/s-0041-111821. Epub 2016 Apr 26. PMID: 27116531.
- 2: Magliyah MSA, Al-Khars WI. Ocular toxoplasmosis related macular traction: A case report and review of the literature. *Saudi J Ophthalmol*. 2019 Jan- Mar;33(1):84-87. doi: 10.1016/j.sjopt.2018.07.002. Epub 2018 Jul 26. PMID: 30930669; PMCID: PMC6424709.
- 3: Lin HY, Lee WA. The Role of Corticosteroids in Treating Acute Ocular Toxoplasmosis in an Immunocompetent Patient: A Case Report. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2022 Jun 29;9:843050. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2022.843050. PMID: 35847774; PMCID: PMC9276926.

[Reference 1 and 2 as required.](#)

**12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation.** Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?

Yes.

**13 Research methods and reporting.** Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - **Case report**; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - **Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial**; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review,

Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?

Yes.

**14 Ethics statements.** For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

Yes.

## **Reviewer#2**

**Specific comments:** Kindly go through manuscript and correct language as well as citation

**Answer:** Thanks for your comments. We had sent the manuscript to the language company two revise.

## Revision-reviewer

### Specific comments to authors

1. Please explain why the authors think these 2 cases were similar to clinical findings of Toxoplasmosis? Was the patient received any serum test of Toxo-IgM? Or the patient had any histories which were related to Toxoplasmosis?

Serum test of Toxo-IgM was not done, so part of the OT content in the article was deleted.

2. Please describe more about surgical or treatment choice for CHRRPE. When do patients need to receive vitrectomy? Are there reports about this information?

When do patients need to receive vitrectomy? there are no reports about this information. The primary purpose of vitrectomy in this patient was to remove the proliferative membrane on the surface of the lesion and prevent progression to retinal detachment.

3. I think the references were too out of date. Please add the following references: (1) Combined Hamartoma of the Retina and Retinal Pigment Epithelium: An Optical Coherence Tomography-Based Reappraisal. Chawla R, Kumar V, Tripathy K, Kumar A, Venkatesh P, Shaikh F, Vohra R, Molla K, Verma S. Am J Ophthalmol. 2017 Sep;181:88-96. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2017.06.020. Epub 2017 Jun 29. PMID: 28669779 (2) Hamartomas of the Retina and Optic Disc. Mirzayev I, Gündüz AK. Turk J Ophthalmol. 2022 Dec 28;52(6):421-431. doi: 10.4274/tjo.galenos.2022.25979. PMID: 36578224 (3) Combined hamartoma of the retina and retinal pigment epithelium - MRI features of a rare paediatric intraocular tumour. Waelti S, Fischer T, Sturm V, Heckmann J. BJR Case Rep. 2020 Nov 17;7(2):20200077. doi: 10.1259/bjrcr.20200077. eCollection 2021 Apr 1. PMID: 33841897

References have been modified as requested.