

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/amj-23-105>

Review comments

Reviewer A

A better support that a Covid infection preceded the PION is needed. Were pos tested persons in his direct environment at that time? Are there other specific observations to support a preceding Covid infection?

He reported symptoms compatible with Covid and showed a positive naso-pharyngeal swab. As he lived alone at the time no close contacts were tested. We have added details to the text (lines 100 to 102) and the timeline.

You underscore endothelial vasculopathy as the pathological mechanism of the optic nerve event. Did you test vit D status?

Unfortunately, we did not.

Dit patiënt use statins?

He did. Relevant information was added to the text (line 103)

Line 21 twice 'although'

Removed one (line 28).

Line 26. Non-reactive

Text was modified accordingly (line 37)

Line 31 suspension after the PION or in the period therefore? Answer is line 105

In the period following PION, made it more clear in the text (line 43)

Line 34. Better English formulation needed

Modified the text (line 62-64)

Line 53 should evaluate vascular risk factors including post viral vasculopathy

Text was modified (highlights box)

Line 84. Within limits.... Better: was, besides non-reactive pupils, unremarkable.

Text was modified as suggested (line 119)

Line 96. Was made

Text was modified as suggested (line 128)

Line 139. After recovery, instead of after healing

Text was modified as suggested (line 190)

Reviewer B

I think the case is well thought through and presented, and provides good information for clinicians who see patients with PION, needing to establish a differential diagnosis and treatment plan.

Thank you very much for your kind comment

The authors should mention if the patient had pain on eye movement, which might suggest retrobulbar optic neuritis as a cause, rather than PION.

Details have been added to the text (lines 98-99)

The authors might consider addressing in the conclusions whether the steroid treatment (although directed at GCA) might have helped settle down the presumed COVID-related vasculopathy that might have been involved in triggering the PION. Should we use steroids to treat these patients, in addition to supporting their blood pressure?

A paragraph has been added to the text regarding steroid treatment (lines 214-232)

There are a number of grammatical and word-choice corrections, including what I recommend as a change of “known” risk factors for NAION to “likely” risk factors:

Text was modified accordingly (line 167)

Line 76: “significant” instead of “significative”

Text was modified (line 100)

Line 78: “pharyngeal” instead of “faryngeal”

Text was modified (line 102)

Line 81: “haematological” instead of “haemathological”

Text was modified (line 117)

Line 94: “Considering” instead of “Considered”

Text was modified (line 127)

Line 99: “methylprednisolone” instead of “metilprednisolone”

Text was modified (line 130)

“Giant Cell Arteritis” instead of “Giant Cells Arteritis”

Text was modified (line 131 and 133)

Line 117: “Likely risk factors” is more accurate than “Known risk factors”

Text was modified (line 167)

Line 119: Take out “ulterior”

Text was modified (line 169)

Line 136: “presented” instead of “presenting”

Text was modified (line 189)

Line 142, 145: “monocular” instead of “monolateral”

Text was modified (lines 192 and 194)

Line 163: “COVID” instead of “covid”

Text was modified (line 211)

Line 175: “ophthalmologists” instead of “ophthalmologist”

Text was modified (line 244)

Line 274: “the optic discs” rather than just “optic”

Text was modified (line 336)