Reviewer's report

Title: Intravitreal injection of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor agents versus photodynamic therapy for polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy: A meta-analysis

Version: 1 Date: 9 May 2015

Reviewer: Elizabeth Wong

Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Line 145: I2 statistic, not I2.

Lines 185-186: When VA change was treated as a categorical variable, the percentages of improved, stable, and deteriorated VA at final visits were compared. The duration to final follow-up for each selected study were not the same and could lead to lack of consistency, and should be highlighted.

Table 1: Header for Age and Follow-up do not explain what each pair of data meant, unlike Sex, which indicated that the pair of numbers was for male/female.

Table 2: Header should include (mean ± SD) for Lesion GLD, similar to Number of Treatments.

Was there an attempt to obtain the individual patient data from the study investigators / authors? It would have been better if the literature search included unpublished trials as well.

Discretionary Revisions

Line 89-98: It was mentioned that there were 2 reviewers who did the data extraction. Did the same reviewers do the screening for selection of studies, which was narrowed down to the 6 studies, independently?

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.
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