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Reviewer's report:

The title is not relevant for the current study. This is not a study for long-term outcomes. I recommend to revise the title as 'Comparative study of endolaser versus cryocoagulation in vitrectomy for rhegmatogenous retinal detachment.'

Most importantly, it was not clear which retinopexy was used for which eye. The main purpose was to compare the outcomes of two retinopexy methods, and it was retrospective study. Accordingly, it should be described how the retinopexy method was selected for RRD surgery in the method section.

In the method section, the types of tamponade were only SF6 and C3F8. But in the results, silicone oil was used in patients of a significant number. Remove the patients of SO use from the study, or describe in which eye SO was selected.

The baseline characteristics were not investigated to confirm the similar efficacy of two methods. Number of breaks, detachment extent, symptom duration, number of laser spots/cryo ice balls … should be also compared among three retinopexy groups.

To support the results of no difference, it should be confirmed that there were no differences according to the retinopexy methods. In the table 1, all the baseline characteristics should be shown and compared among three retinopexy groups.

In the method section, follow-up period was not shown. The inclusion and exclusion criteria must be listed.

It was already well-known and cannot be a main conclusion that PVR was the important reason of recurrence. Furthermore, it was not related to the purpose of the study.

I don't understand why cryo and endolaser were combined. Is there any case that one method is not sufficient to treat all the breaks? If any, it could be significant selection bias in the study.

In the introduction, the author cited old paper that both laser and cryoretinopexy required 2-3 weeks to obtain chorioretinal adhesion. But, more recent paper of Yoon et al. (Ophthalmology 95:1385-8, 1998) demonstrated sufficient adhesion force is generated more rapidly after laser retinopexy.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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