



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_28289
Title of the Manuscript:	Recurrent glaucoma drainage device erosion in association with occult infection with biofilm-producing organisms
Type of Article:	Case Report

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Although revision is improved there still is mention that uveitits may be at higher risk of extrusion. Chronic steroids are also potentially involved as the patient had multiple episodes of uveitis . The bacteria may have become attached to the implant after erosion rather than before. Thus the authors although addressing the comments made didn't think them through with thoughtful responses Also the writing no longer flows and doesn't follow properly. If reporting the visual field data years out a baseline needs reporting just stating stable would be adequate with noting stage at onset The concept and conclusion are now more appropriate	We would like to thank the journal team and reviewers for the rigorous assessment of our paper, which we now feel is significantly improved and makes an important contribution to the field of GDD erosion. Comments regarding the influence of topical steroid therapy on local immune defence and the uncertainties of the exact timing of GDD colonisation are included. The case presentation timeline has been streamlined so that it easier to follow the exact sequence of events in the complicated clinical course. The statement regarding visual field in the case presentation has been changed.