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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The type of lens used for application of laser in these patients has not been mentioned by the authors though they have mentioned that the spot size was uniform in both groups (100 microns). The type of lens used and its magnification factor is important for the effective spot size on the retina.

2. The total (mean) number of laser spots applied in each group are not mentioned. This can effect the final outcome and scotoma size in these patients.

3. Being a prospective study a standardized visual acuity chart like ETDRS should be used for measuring the visual acuity. However the visual acuity chart used is not mentioned in the manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Page 8 second paragraph 5th line- P<0.05 instead of P<0.5

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

General Comments
This is an interesting study. However it would have been useful if the authors had compared the treatment of CSCR (CSR) with Diode red 810 nm laser and 532 nm (Double frequency) green laser instead of the 514 nm argon laser. The 532 nm laser is now the standard laser used by most retinologists.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No
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