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Reviewer’s report:

This paper shows results of a randomized placebo study of antioxidant vitamins in acute CSC. The rationale is rather thin, from this reviewer’s standpoint, as links to oxidative dysfunction seem rather tenuous; but the study provides controlled evidence. The vitamins had no effect on eventual acuity, which is good to know; but it seemed to reduce fluid and leakage relative to controls.

MAJOR REVISIONS NEEDED:

However, these leakage results point out the most serious problem with the study: subjects included patients with both new and recurrent attacks, and also with both inkblot or smoke stack leakage. The drug randomization is handled well, but different CSC types are mixed together, which obscures potential effects (or may account for some of them, or change them). Recurrent CSC can behave very differently than primary disease, especially after multiple attacks; and the implications of focal or diffuse leakage are different. So without tabulating these groups with respect to drug/control and with respect to results, it is hard to know whether the leakage findings are real or merely a reflection of the type of CSC in selected patients. It is critical that the authors indicate the number of patients with first or recurrent attacks, and each leakage types, in the drug vs. control groups. And then show whether final thickness and leakage relates to the original CSC type and findings.

The discussion is too long, and quite redundant in repeating many of the Introduction and Results phrases almost word for word. It also has major grammatical problems. Just a few examples are below:

“many studies showed some advantages of some drugs…” has too many “somes” and makes little sense as it really says nothing

“showed no statistical significant.” is not proper

“primary pathology in choroids should be attacked directly by any oxidative radicals and give secondary effect to RPE…” makes no sense and has tense and other errors.

Sentence “This means that, even the …” is long, convoluted and a grammatical mess.

Careful reading and consultation with an experienced English writer would help.

A figure showing examples of fluid on OCT, and more importantly the typical
patterns of leakage on angiography, would help readers to know how the cases are defined.
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