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ABSTRACT

Background:
The first line is very long and need to be re-phrased into 2-3 separate sentences.
Line 3 should read as co-exist not co-exists
Methods
15 patients with SRD and 38 patients with CME should be mentioned as a result not in the Methods section
Results:
Please mention P value if possible along with significance to give a more objective value of your observation.
Conclusion
Please also mention that ‘SRD does not seem to have an effect on macular function on microperimetry’ as per your findings.

BACKGROUND
First paragraph last line does not convey its meaning and should be modified to
‘Thus more detailed investigation into the functional implication of anatomical and pathological changes may be important.’

METHODS
Subjects
Mean age of Patients and duration of BRVO should be in the Results Section of the Manuscript.
The details on how patients were classified as hypertension seem redundant and can be omitted.

The average non perfused area should be a Result item rather than being a part
Why was the macular volume calculated by multiplying the area with the retinal thickness rather than using the Macular Volume Protocol of the Stratus OCT Machine.

RESULTS
The fact that only 15 out of 53 patients in this study had SRD is surprising when compared to previous literature.
Spaide et al found it in 10 of 14 patients (71.4%) (reference 11 of your article.)
While Shroff et al reported a SRD in 12 out of 20 patients studied (60%) (reference 13) and Tsujikava (Ref 14) had a rate of 83.5%.

DISCUSSION
Paragraph 2 last line reads. 'In treated cases a difference was noted as macular sensitivity……'
However according to the exclusion criteria of the study (Methods paragraph 2) Only treatment naïve patients were included. Please explain.
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