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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)
This is an interesting article on an important topic.

However I do have a number of concerns:

• The authors retrospectively compare two groups of preterm babies: 43 who received topical ketorolac and 35 who did not. Unfortunately the 2 groups were studied sequentially and were not contemporaneous. This severely limits any conclusions

• The number of babies with severe ROP is so small that the authors are not justified in making any conclusion about the efficacy of ketorolac in preventing disease progression

• In a number of places in the article the authors go into extreme detail in an attempt to explain ROP pathogenesis. Although this is of interest it is not pertinent to the article.

• A number of abbreviations are used without explanation

• Several references are not numbered correctly

• There are a number of stylistic issues.

I realise that this review is rather harsh, however the authors have undertaken a considerable amount of work. Perhaps a solution would to shorten this submission and present it as scientific correspondence rather than as a full paper. The authors make the sensible suggestion that a randomised control trial is required to determine whether or not ketorolac has a role on ROP prevention.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

None