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Reviewer’s report:

The paper meets requirements of BMC Ophthalmology and length is also correct.

The title describes the article and conveys what has been found.

Sections of the manuscript are correct. It is also well organized.

The introduction resumes the main points of the paper; the thesis of the paper is clear.

The question posed by the authors is well defined.

The figures are as clear as they can be and they appear to be genuine, although tables have lot of data.

The manuscript adheres to the standards for reporting and data deposition.

The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data.

The data are sound and compare with other studies performed in other countries.

The limitations of the work are well stated.

The authors clearly acknowledge on the published work on this subject to build this paper. References include pertinent materials and sources are appropriately integrated and cited.

Quality of written English seems to be OK.

The study adds data on prognostic data of treatment of wet AMD and addresses an important question for practicing retina specialists.

Nevertheless there are some things that need to be clarify:

There are a number of limitations in study design that temper the robustness of the conclusions. The sensitivity and specificity of the model, for example are rather low but not too bad and probably the addition of genetic factors would improve those scores.
These results were obtained despite the fact that the study is not prospective but with defined treatment protocols.

Taken together, these facts lead me to anticipate that the reproducibility of the results could be low, and authors should state this in their paper.

Nevertheless the obtained related factors with worse anatomic outcomes such us older age, worse vision, presence of atrophy/fibrosis, pigment epithelium detachment, and geographic atrophy/fibrotic scar/neovascular AMD in the fellow eye, seem to be reasonable. In addition Factors associated with higher probability of GA such as presence of atrophy and greater number of injections make sense.

Nevertheless the results the authors have obtained should be applied prospectively to a cohort of patients treated according to a precisely specified posology.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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