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Reviewer's report:

Bentivoglio and colleagues report a large clinical series comparing the outcomes following pars-plana vitrectomy for rhegmatogenous retinal detachment with retinal adhesions stimulated by endolaser vs trans-scleral cryopexy. They find little difference between these two methods for creating a retinal adhesion by means of generating a chorioretinal scar. In passing, they note poorer outcomes in eyes with PVR and/or those requiring tamponade with silicone oil.

The authors are to be commended for assembling this large clinical case series, and for compiling and reporting their outcomes. However the value of the report to inform clinical decisions is reduced by the absence of randomization between retinopexy methodologies -- or even any explanation of the thought processes of the surgeons in deciding which treatment to use. The secondary observation of poorer outcomes in the presence of PVR is not at all new or novel; the observation of poorer outcomes with silicone oil again begs the question as to what were the indications for this treatment modality, and, presumably, reflects as much the severity of the retinal pathology as the influence of the choice of treatment.
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