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Reviewer's report:

Takase and Oveson provide an interesting addition to the literature regarding prophylactic laser barricade in the context of combined phacoemulsification/macular hole surgery and RRD. With some essential revisions regarding the data presented in the manuscript I would recommend acceptance.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. The overall rate of RRD in the macular hole series is 1.7% (2/112), which is in keeping with the historically reported rates of RRD after macular holes. In the context of a non-prospective randomized trial it is difficult to determine statistically whether the difference between the two groups is truly related to the addition of 360 prophylactic laser retinopexy. For this reason it would be essential to know the incidence of RRD in Dr. Tawase's series of macular holes prior to the initiation of this cohort.

2. What was the rate of cataract surgery complications in the series overall and in each group? Were the RRDs more common in patients with cataract surgery complications?

Minor essential revisions:

1. A more comprehensive discussion of the literature would be useful in the introduction. An 11% rate of RRD after macular hole repair is somewhat misleading as most recent literature has reported a much lower ~1.5% rate of RRD:
   a. rizzo et al; Retina 2010; 1.7% incidence of RD after MH
   b. rasouli et al; CJO 2012; 1.1% incidence of RRD after macular surgery
   c. Guillaubey et al; BJO 2007; 6.6% incidence of RRD
   d. Hwang et al Retina 2007; 0% incidence of retinal detachment (n=235)
   e. Sjaarda et al ophthalmology 1995; 1.1% incidence of RD

The majority of the above series are using small incision vitrectomy surgery vs. the 20 gauge surgery Dr. Tawase prefers, but it would be important to present this literature more comprehensively in the discussion.
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