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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revision

I enjoyed reading this retrospective case-series analysis on Afibercept and Ranibizumab as a first-line treatment in patients suffering from AMD in real life clinical practice.

In general terms the paper does not offer too much new information about the two drugs in the treatment of AMD. In addition, as a retrospective study, it has a lot of limitations: non randomised nature of the study, selection bias, size of the sample (11 eyes treated with Afibercept and 16 eyes treated with Ranibizumab), bias in the measurements of visual acuity, etc. Thus, the conclusions that you can draw out from these kind of studies as a reader are usually quite imprecise and vague.

However, it is a very well written paper, with a good bibliographic revision. And all of the limitations, seem to be well clarified and justified in the MS.

Its interest from a clinical point of view is really important, because it offers an “independent” information in nvAMD management in real life clinical practice. In addition, according with the authors, it is the first study comparing Ranibizumab’s and Afibercept’s efficacy in real life setting

Minor points:

1. Add p-values and CI in table 1.

2. Add more emphasis regarding how these kind of “independent” studies will be helpful to the clinical ophthalmologists

3. Also, it will be interesting to see whether there were any differences in the systemic vascular safety between two drugs.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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