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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

I have the following comments regarding this manuscript:

- Page 2, Abstract: Methods- The number of the patients is confusing. Is it 11 or 16? (from page 3-Methods). This should be corrected.
- Page 2, Abstract: Results- Regarding numeric values, SD or SEM should be stated.
- Page 4, Methods: Inclusion criteria are confusing: All focal laser treatments were excluded or not?
- Page 5, Methods: Statistics applied should be written. What was the significance level?
- Page 6, Results: Cataract development and use of glaucoma medication in this series should be noted.
- Page 7, Discussion: With SBT injection 10 times more drug is injected compared to IVT way. This should be discussed.

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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