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Author's response to reviews:

Reviewer's report
Title: Intravitreal injection of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor agents versus photodynamic therapy for polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy: A meta-analysis
Version: 2 Date: 16 June 2015
Reviewer: Augustinus Laude

Reviewer's report:
The authors have addressed all my comments satisfactorily. I believe this manuscript is ready to be considered for publication.
Our response: Thank you!

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

Reviewer's report
Title: Intravitreal injection of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor agents versus photodynamic therapy for polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy: A meta-analysis
Version: 2 Date: 11 June 2015
Reviewer: Fiona O J Luk

Reviewer's report:
Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Line 198-200: "There was insufficient data about adverse effects, restricting the ability of meta-analyses to evaluate the efficacy of adverse effects occurring." This sentence needs to be re-phrased.
Our response: Thank you for your careful review and valuable suggestion. We had changed this sentence to “There were insufficient data about adverse effects, therefore, most of adverse effects were not pooled in the present meta-analysis.” (page 8; paragraph 2, line 198-200)

2. Line 218-219. Does the author mean "the frequency of retreatments for both PDT and anti-VEGF groups is not uniform in different studies”?

Our response: Thank you! That's what it means. We had changed this sentence to “the frequency of retreatments for both PDT and anti-VEGF groups is not uniform in different studies”. (page 8; paragraph 4, line 218-219)

3. Line 253-254. "This seemed reasonable, because only two studies in the meta-analysis reported this complication." Why does the author think this is reasonable?

Our response: Thank you! This is an inappropriate expression. We had changed this sentence to “Of note, the present meta-analysis only included two studies, the small sample size should also be taken into consideration and this finding should be interpreted with caution.” in the revised manuscript. (page 10; paragraph 1, line 253-255).

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.