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Reviewer's report:

The edits to the manuscript have made it a much stronger paper, I think. I want to congratulate the authors.

I have 3 short comments:

1. The significant result mentioned in the first line of the abstract regarding re-vitrectomy...I would include this sentence in the body of the results section as well as it is a key finding.

2. I think it would be helpful to include a sentence or two as to why re-injection was included in the re-operations. That makes total sense to me now that I understand the setting. Taking someone back to the OR for an injection is certainly a use of resources worth tracking, and if there is something you can do to lower the number of re-injections, it's relevant.

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.
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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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