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Answer to reviewer and editorial comments:-

Editorial comments & reply:-

1. Please ensure that the limitations of your study are clearly stated in your discussion section.

Reply: All limitations of the study are stated clearly in the discussion section.

2. Please include the name of the institutional review board that approved your study in your methods section.

Reply: Local institutional review board name included.

3. Please include a 'Competing interests' section between the Conclusions and Authors' contributions. If there are none to declare, please write 'The authors declare that they have no competing interests'.

The questions that are asked of authors are:

Financial competing interests:
- In the past five years have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? Is such an organization financing this manuscript (including the article-processing charge)? If so, please specify.
- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? If so, please specify.
- Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript? Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript? If so, please specify.
- Do you have any other financial competing interests? If so, please specify.

Non-financial competing interests: are there any non-financial competing interests (political, personal, religious, academic, ideological, intellectual, commercial or any other) to declare in relation to this manuscript? If so, please specify.

Reply: No competing or financial interest, stated in the cover letter and in the manuscript.

4. Please include an Authors' contributions section before the Acknowledgements and Reference list.

For the Authors' contributions we suggest the following kind of format (please use
initials to refer to each author's contribution): AB carried out the molecular genetic studies, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. JY carried out the immunoassays. MT participated in the sequence alignment. ES participated in the design of the study and performed the statistical analysis. FG conceived of the study, and participated in its design and coordination. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

An "author" is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. To qualify as an author one should 1) have made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) have been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) have given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content. Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not justify authorship.

All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an acknowledgments section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person who provided purely technical help, writing assistance, or a department chair who provided only general support.

**Reply:** As suggested, authors’ contribution section included.

5. Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the study by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include their source(s) of funding. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study. Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements. Please list the source(s) of funding for the study, for each author, and for the manuscript preparation in the acknowledgements section. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

**Reply:** Acknowledged.

6. Please include some context information in the background section of the abstract.

**Reply:** Background added in the abstract.
Reviewer's 1 report & reply:-

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? YES
3. Are the data sound? YES
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? NO.

Reply: Limitations of the study added.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES

1. Introduction should be shortened to a few references for introducing the question. **Reply:** As advised, introduction shortened with few references.

2. Documentation of the injury characteristics in the study population according to Ocular Trauma Classification System (OTCS) is recommended. Table should be given. **Reply:** Table added with distribution of injury characteristics as per OTCS.

3. Documentation of the injury characteristics in the study population according to the Ocular Trauma Score (OTS) and inclusion of the OTS in the discussion section are recommended. Table should be given. **Reply:** Table given.

4. When did they perform vitrectomy or secondary interventions (early, late...?) and type surgical interventions? **Reply:** Information added.

5. Is median (or mean) follow up 18.9 months?
6. Is there any physical eye?

Reply: Information added.

7. In addition to univariate multivariate analysis is recommended.

Reply: As the sample size is very small, statistician felt that the multivariate analysis is not possible for this sample size. We have added in the detailed correlation coefficient for all the variables in the study and table is provided.

8. All the numbers should be stated with the percentages(%)?

Reply: % added to all the numbers.

9. Statistical methods should be selected carefully (Mann Whitney and ANOVA for correlation?); correlation coefficient for the results should be included.

Reply: Amended as per suggestion.

10. Shortening of the discussion is advised.

Reply: Discussion: Shortened and amended as per suggestions.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
Declaration of competing interests: No relation to declare
Reviewer 2 report & reply:

This paper intends to investigate the surgical treatment of severely traumatized eyes with initial visual acuity of no light perception. The argument is still debated in literature and therefore of interest, but the present study appears not to reach the purpose due to some major flaws.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Title: The title does not seem applicable as the work does not focus on surgical treatments but investigates about the predictability of some factors on the surgical outcome.

Reply: Thanks for the valuable comment. Title amended as per suggestion.

2. Patients and methods: The authors should provide further information about the geographic localization and the eye trauma services in the area so that the readers can get a better understanding of the location and of the medical events that are cared.

Reply: Information added.


Reply: Amended as per suggestion.

4. Statistical analysis section would be moved from the results section to methods section.

Reply: Amended as per suggestion.

5. Result section: This section should be articulated better reporting the results in a more extended manner. All predictive factors considered in this paper would be reported in a table (even those without correlation with statistical significance).

Reply: Amended as per suggestion.

6. The authors do not utilize the Ocular Trauma Score, the digital prognostication system. Also in this case it could be reported a table reporting the likelihood of the final visual acuity category by the OTS score in comparison with the Ocular Trauma Score (OTS) Study.
Reply: OTS added and correlation done.

7. In this paper it is not analyzed the role of IOFB as predictive factor for surgical outcome.

Reply: information added.

8. Discussion: It seems too long, it is not always inherent in the topic, and also tends to restore the results already mentioned.

Reply: Amended.

9. The discussion should include a paragraph on the limitations of the study among which include: the retrospectivity of the study, the variable related to the diversity of the surgeons that have occurred over time; etc.

Reply: Amended.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.