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Reviewer's report:

Title - would change to "Risk factors for glial cell proliferation after idiopathic macular hole repair with internal limiting membrane flap"
Abstract - results would not use both 'more or deeper' - chose one adjective
Would also state in abstract if this was prospective or retrospective study or case control study

Background
I would elaborate a bit more on glial cell proliferation, though there have been studies on this, it is not a widespread feature commented on after routine macular hole repair

Methods
Even if retrospective because this study involves use of patient data, would need IRB approval at most institutions
Demographics of the cohort should be in the results section
Should specify if a single physician observe determined if this was group A or group B or if concordance between two reviewers was needed
Line 116 - there should be period after inverted, before phacoemulsification

Results
The MLD between the two groups is a confounding factor for the results
We need to know how the OCT structural measurements were done - single observer? Two observes with mean value? I do not think this is specified in the results section

We also need to know if every single patient had an inverted ILM flap - as we know sometimes the flap can be lost or not ideal - I did not see mention in the results that I:M flap was attained surgically in 100% of patients, if so this should be stated

Discussion
Line 261 - it is confusing using both adjectives 'more and deeper' consider other phrases such as 'more extensive' or 'more robust'

Conclusion
The authors comment significantly about vision but do not mention the visual acuity disparities in the conclusion between the groups

Figures
Figure 5 - I want to know if patient on the left is group A and patient on the right is group B? Not specified as in the supplemental figures
I think one of the supplemental files would be good to include or combine figures 5, S1, S2 into one figure
It would be helpful for the authors to point out glial cell proliferation on a standard SD-OCT image as not all readers may be familiar with this pattern - alternatively it could be marked out with arrow on existing OCT images.

Tables
Table 1 is good but could remove the text of this in the methods section, does not need to be repeated

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.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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