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Reviewer's report:

It is clear that a great deal of work has been put into this paper and length of follow-up data collated however; it is poorly worded and requires restructuring. There are far too many examples of this needed throughout the paper to quote here.

How can you classify disease activity based on fundoscopic appearance alone? If this was a retrospective notes review and/or OCT was not available or not utilised then this should be stated as so.

You list ‘others’ for the side effects not listed – these reasons need to be stated in full either in the appendix or in a table.

Secondary effects – you didn’t mention what these were exactly
Did any of your patients have an ICG to visualise the polypoid lesions?

The OCT machines used throughout the study were different – was any attempt made to standardise the readings between the various devices to adjust for variations/errors?

It is not clear what this study adds to the current published literature on this topic. Furthermore, technology exists on modern OCT to calculate a change in CRT from successive OCTs performed.

In summary, the paper needs to be re-structured and better worded to improve the clarity of information conveyed. The above points should be addressed and the authors need to state what this paper adds to the current literature on the topic.

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.
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