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Reviewer's report:

vComments to author:

The authors elaborate on their study to evaluate the factors responsible for aberrant glial cell proliferation postoperatively after macular hole surgery.

Whether the ethical committee approval was obtained or not? Contradictory statements have been produced in the "methods" section and in the "ethics approval" section.

The demographic results might be included in the "results" section.

A more proper definition of the two groups "normal healing" and "aberrant healing" must be provided. How was aberrant healing anatomically defined based on OCT? based on what parameters? When was the reading done (post op day)? It is difficult to differentiate between ILM flap tissue and glial tissue on OCT.

Without proper differentiation between two groups, the study looks like as if it is evaluating the factors responsible for poor closure.

What was the macular hole closure rate? 100%?

The SS-OCT specifications are given as: 840nm wavelength and 70000 scan rate.. But these are spectral domain OCT specifications. As SS-OCT - works on 1050 nm and 1 lakh scan rate
Was room air used as tamponade in all cases? Even in larger diameters MH?

Microperimetry could have been performed to confirm the authors proposal of para foveal fixation

The ILM filling and abnormal glial proliferation - needs more statistical explanations.

More figures of sample cases can be provided

The entire article can be cut-short as there are ample repetitions

Spell errors and grammatical errors need to be addressed

rewrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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