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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

1. In introduction, third sentence beginning from “In 1999, Tokano and Kishi speculated that…” , this article must be referred in the references section.


If so, an author’s name is spelled wrong.

2. Multiple regression analysis is necessary to evaluate the outcome parameters in Table 2. Improvements of IS/OS defects, BCVA, and RS after vitrectomy may be affected by preoperative parameters (age, axial lengths, etc.).

3. In materials and methods, grouping section, the differences between three groups must be clarified with diagrams. In what criteria are patient OCT images grouped? Are your grouping methods supported by other research articles?

4. In discussion, 7th paragraph, third sentence, what do you mean by “…a retrospective series an hardly do this due to lack of design for specific purpose and selection bias…”?? This sentence is very ambiguous.

Minor essential revisions:

5. “23G pars plana vitrectomy” in abstract, conclusion paragraph should be mentioned in abstract, methods paragraph, i.e., “surgery” in abstract, methods paragraph may be revised to “vitrectomy” or “pars plana vitrectomy”. Referring to “23G” may not be necessary in a context of this article.

6. In Abstract, Methods section, 2nd sentence, “3th” should read “3rd”.

7. Table 1: “preoperative paraments” should read “preoperative parameters”.

Discretionary revision: All minor issues not for publication

8. In Abstract, Methods section, 3rd sentence, “Photoreceptor” doesn’t need to be capitalized

9. In Abstract, Methods section, 4th sentence, a space between the word “Group” and the numbers should be included like you have done later in the manuscript.

10. In Abstract, Results section, final sentence, same mistake with spacing, see above.

12. In Introduction, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, “…HMMH stage that patients benefit most from…” should read “…HMMH stage patients would benefit most from…”

13. In Materials and Methods, Data collection section, 2nd sentence, “…1 month, 3 months, and 9 preoperative after surgery…” should read “…1 month, 3 months, and 9 months after surgery….”

14. In Materials and Methods, Microperimetry section, 1st sentence, “Padua, Italy, Nidek technology” may be revised to “Nidek technologies, Padua, Italy”.

15. In Materials and Methods, “Grouping” should read “Groupings”.

16. In Materials and Methods, Surgical approach section, final sentence, “Silicone oil” doesn’t need to be capitalized.

17. In Discussion, 7th paragraph, 4th sentence, “But we used…” may be changed to “However, we used…”

18. In Discussion, 7th paragraph, final sentence, again “prospective, long-term study” would be needed for what? (see above)

19. In Authors’ contributions section, second sentence, “HX involved…” should read “HX was involved…”

20. In Acknowledgements section, you could write simply “None” or “There are no acknowledgements.”

21. In Tables 2 and 3, you wrote what the abbreviations mean, ie, BCVA=best corrected visual acuity, but you didn’t do any of this in Table 1.

22. Table 3: Descriptions for r and p values are absent

23. In Figure legends, Figure 1, “see two-way arrow” should be plural to read “see two way

24. Figure 2: You have written Figure 2 over your scale. Can you place this elsewhere so the reader can read the scale without any difficulties?

25. Figure 3: write 3 months after surgery and 9 months after surgery

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.
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