Reviewer's report

**Title:** 23 Gauge Ppv For The Removal Of Retained Intraocular Foreign Bodies

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 1 January 2015

**Reviewer:** Khalil Ghasemi Falavarjani

**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting report, however, following points should be considered before final decision:

1. **Title:** posterior segment foreign bodies. Also, this method is a hybrid method of 23 gauge and larger incision for IOFB removal. This should be considered in the conclusion as well.

2. **Abstract:** Morpho-functional may be replaced by Anatomical and functional outcomes.

3. **Abstract:** The phrase "Association between ..." is awkward. Please rework.

4. **Abstract and text:** The Logmar range of 0 to 1.00 means VA of 20/20 to 20/200, however, based on the mean Logmar, and based on the text and table, many patients should have worse Logmar acuities.

5. **Abstract:** elevationoma?

6. **Abstract and text:** Please define anatomical success. If one patient resulted in phtisis, the anatomical success should be less than 100%.


8. **Methods:** Please give additional data on study design and inclusions. Is this a consecutive case series of patients or some inclusion criteria existed on selection of patients for 23 gauge. in other word, was there any preference for selecting 23 G for some patients?

9. **Methods:** Any prophylactic circumferential buckle?

10. **Methods:** What was the indication for gas injection?

11. **Results:** Two months is too short to conclude any thing.

12. **Results:** VA outcomes: Please report percentage of cases with 2 or 3 lines of worsening or improvement.

13. **Results:** Surgical procedures: Silicone oil was injected in five eye and 7 of them underwent SO removal?

14. **Discussion:** 2nd paragraph: Mobilization of the retina is a method for surgery in severe PVR.

15. **Discussion:** "However, there are no published studies on outcomes of 23-G
PPV for posterior segment IOFBs. " In contrast, there is a published study by Singh et al. Indian J Ophthalmol, 2014.
16. I could not see any thing regarding the size of the IOFBs in the text and tables.
17. It was interesting to see a multivariable analysis to find any association with outcomes.
18. Reference No. 32 is repetitive.

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:
No conflict of interest.