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Reviewer's report:

General

The manuscript has been well written and indicated useful information to treat the patients with diabetic macular edema even evaluated in small numbers of the patients. However, some critical problems which required to clarify before acceptance of the manuscript were noticed.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. The volume of the triamcinolone should be mentioned in the abstract

2. The numbers of the patients were unclear, 11 patients in abstract, but 14 patients in the text.

3. They made some statistical analysis but there was no description about what kind of statistical analysis was made.

4. Page 4 line 9, The authors mentioned all focal lakes previously was treated by laser photocoagulation. However, they also mentioned the patients with focal or grid laser photocoagulation was excluded. This issue should be clarified.

5. The lens status; phakic, pseudophakic, or aphakic should affect clearance of intravitreal triamcinolone. Although the authors mentioned that the history of previous ocular surgery was excluded in the criteria of the study, it may be better to mention that all the eyes were phakic.

6. The values of decrimal points were not adequate. IOP should be calculated to one decrimal point and macular thickness as well.

6. Page 4 line 18, Two days before the IVT injection, systemic acetazolamide (500mg per day?) was applied. However, acetazolamide had an effect to decrease macular edema. How did the authors eliminate the effect of acetazolamide because no value of macular thickness and visual acuity were not presented before administration of acetazolamide.

minor points
1. Page 2 line 9 'were recruited..' to single period
2. Page 4 line 9 'Maculat' to "Macular"
3. Pge 6 second paragraph '18.20+1.200, 16.182+1.402....) to +- 

**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 limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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