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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript by Namba et al, a patient with exudative retinal detachment involving the macula due to Coats disease has been treated successfully by performing photodynamic therapy (PDT) instead of cryotherapy and laser photocoagulation because a vascular abnormality located near the superior retinal vascular arcade. The retina was characterized precisely before the treatment (Fig. 1), and an effectiveness of the PDT therapy has been clearly demonstrated by showing overview and cross-section pictures of the retina (Fig. 2).

The manuscript is well written, and this case report would be valuable to facilitate further investigations for the topic.

I have a couple of questions and comments:

1) Korean J Ophthalmol 2010;24:374-376 should be cited, in which a treatment with PDT and intravitreal Bevacizumab injection has been presented in a patient with Coats disease. The sentence on Page 4 lines 18-20 should be reformulated accordingly.

2) Is PDT for this disease "off label" in Japan? How about adding this point together with disorders for which PDT has been approved in your country because the situations regarding PDT would be different among countries?

3) Please add the stage of Coats disease in which the patient at the initial visit was.

4) Page 2 line 11: "abnormal lower vision" should be corrected.

5) Page 4 lines 9-10: This sentence is currently confusing and should be optimized for a better readability.
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