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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done a nice review of the studies related to the treatment outcomes of PCV patients using either PDT or antiVEGF injections.

The methodology used is sound and the paper is well-written.

Major revisions.

One of the major limitation of this findings is that most of the studies identified were retrospective in nature and this point has been mentioned. However, I was surprised that there were no considerations given to the frequency of retreatments either for the PDT group or more importantly, the antiVEGF group. The frequency and intervals between treatments can have a profound impact on the clinical outcomes, including the VA and macula thickening. So, the authors need to discuss how they address this major confounder between the study groups.

Another major issue is how the definition of PCV cases were made in these studies. The diagnosis of PCV is not universally agreed upon and many imaging modalities are used for diagnosis incl. but not limited to ICG angiography and OCT.

So, the description of how the diagnosis of the PCV cases should be made clear in order to inform the reader about the confidence of the case definitions.

Minor revisions.

I think line 60 should be revised. I am not sure if the cited paper is meant to be generalised to all forms of PCV. We know for example that solitary PCV may be associated with a benign course and good prognosis.
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