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Reviewer's report:

I was happy to read the revised article: "Comparison of Eylea® with Lucentis® as First-line Therapy in Patients with Treatment-naïve Neovascular Age-related Macular Degeneration in real-life clinical practice: Retrospective case-series analysis". The authors have addressed most of my questions and I think the paper suffered a great improvement. However, I have still some reflections that I will try to address further:

1. Methods: "Demographic data including patient age (at baseline) and gender, number of injections, BCVA and central foveal thickness (CFT) in OCT in included patients were explored" - you should refer to table 1 and other to clarify the information.

2. Methods: the authors have made no reference to the OCT acquisition protocol, raster lines/macular cube? I presume the same protocol was used for all the cases...

3. Statistical analysis: "Differences in population characteristics between patients receiving Ranibizumab and Aflibercept were tested using t-tests" - as I've mentioned, no testing of the normality of the variables was done. I would do a simpler statistical test, but I accept your choice.

4. Results: Effects during follow-up: "increase of CFT in all patients (0.40 µm/d)"? - 0.40 um?

5. Table: The authors should present the measure units: e.g., years old for age, µm for CFT, letters of VA...

6. The baseline characteristics are well presented. However, for me it would make more sense and it would be most representative of the evolutions if you present a variable Change of CFT and Change of BCVA and made the comparisons between both groups in the different time points. Those are the primary outcomes and are not represented in the table. For me the absolute value of BCVA after the treatment in both groups doesn't say much, also because the values were different at the beginning… I will prefer to see the results in 2 different tables, one with baseline characteristics and one with the treatment results.
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