Reviewer's report

Title: High-dose antioxidants for central serous chorioretinopathy; The randomized, placebo-controlled study.

Version: 3 Date: 25 February 2012

Reviewer: Michael Marmor

Reviewer's report:

The paper is much improved, but some concerns of scientific importance persist, and were not fully resolved in the revision.

1. The authors note that only 10% of cases had smokestacks (which could well respond differently to any intervention) but still do not indicate how these divided among drug and placebo. That is the critical point, which has not been answered, even if the number is small. Table 1 must show how many stacks were in group A vs group B. If all in were in one or the other, the effect might no longer be irrelevant.

2. Similarly, Table 2 should show how many stacks, if any, were among the 3 drug or 10 placebo resistant cases. This is information a reader must have.

3. The article emphasizes 10 resistant cases for leakage and 10 for fluid. If these are all or mostly the same patients this should be explicitly stated—these two characteristics are not independent variables for obvious reasons.

4. The conclusions about effects and rationale (choroid vs RPE) may need a bit of tempering insofar as the Group A/B results were identical at 2 months and half the cases had resolved. Thus the apparent difference (i.e. effect) concerns a small group of slower-resolution cases, and which may be resistant for a variety of reasons. This needs a comment at the least.

5. English much better, although sentence in 4th Discussion paragraph beginning “The primary pathology in choroids […]etc.” remains hard to follow.

6. Fig 1 should show a blot leakage—or perhaps both types and eliminate the color image. The issue is that blot leakage is not always well-defined in the diagnosis of CSC, and thus it is this type, more than a classic smokestack, that readers need to see (to judge how the authors define cases).
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