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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. As the author discussed in the limitation section, the study is non-randomized and there is certain difference in the baseline characteristics between the two arms. Retreatment criteria can be different among each physician in the retrospective study. In addition, the number of patients (11 vs 16 eyes) is too small to conclude there is no difference. If the authors stick to the conclusion, they should provide the statistical power such as “If there is ~% difference, the study would prove it with a probability of ~%.”

2. The number of injections is not provided.

Minor Essential Revisions
3. Classification of classic/occult CNV is not appropriate. Almost all AMD cases have occult lesion and some has predominantly classic lesion. Probably the authors classified predominantly classic as classic and minimally classic and occult with no classic as occult. It should be clarified.

4. Page 6 line 133 ranibizumab and aflibercept “will” were… Probably misspelling.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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