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This is a very good study. The authors put forward a new concept "1 + PRN" for PCV treatment. My main concern regards interpretation of the results. As far as I can see, most published papers, especially several meta-analyses (PMID: 28861356, PMID: 25343244, PMID: 26558226, et al) support that combined therapy has better effects as for BCVA improvement and CFT reduction in some specific time-points. This is different from your conclusion. Do "1 + PRN" and "3 + PRN" make difference? In addition, the non-RCT study and relatively small sample size may result in a relatively low statistical power. Maybe you can do some further research in the future.

My suggestion for the present paper is minor revision:

1. The BCVA improvement and CFT reduction from baseline in each time-points should be presented in additional figures and results. They are more important in the comparison of treatment effects than BCVA and CFT themselves. And the comparison based on the changes from baseline between each group should be added. Maybe you can find some new results.

2. Add some possible reasons for the difference conclusions between your study and other studies.
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:
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