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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting manuscript on surgical outcomes of myopic macular hole
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Yes
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Correlation between both observers is missing in the Results section. How many eyes were gradable?
How many eyes achieved surgical success after the first surgery. Were re-operated eyes included?
The numerical data would be better described in tables and a shorter results section would be more reader-friendly
Please, always use units when reporting numerical data.
Discussion
The first paragraph has already been commented in the Introduction
The conclusion “This result suggests that ERM traction, retinoschisis may represent an early stage of HMMH, whereas subretinal fluid appears in the advanced stage” is misleading and not necessarily true, the results only support better visual outcome for less damaged eyes.
The final conclusion is not completely true: several eyes with macular retinoschisis do not further evolve to macular hole and therefore surgery would be questionable
Figure 1 and 3 Group 1 look like full-thickness macular holes
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
10. Is the writing acceptable? Needs some revision

Abstract should be modified:
The inclusion criteria are not described
The initial groups are not described in the results.
Surgical procedure should be described in methods
Conclusions are not supported by reported results

English grammar and spelling should be revised
Explain abbreviations before first use: MP1

**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:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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