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Reviewer's report:

The study entitled "The effect of internal limiting membrane peeling to normal retinal function evaluated by microperimetry-3" tried to evaluate the effect of internal limiting membrane (ILM) peeling to the function of normal retina surrounding macular holes (MH) by microperimetry. There are some problems about this study.

1. In the study, the authors selected those points located in the outer two rings, which did not include the macular hole area and was described as normal retina.

So, the premise of this study may be to suppose that the 4° to 8° area was not affected by the macular hole. However, the results showed that the mean retina sensitivity (MRS) of the selected area increased significantly at 1 and 4 months after ILM peeling. Could you explain why the MRS of the so called normal retina increased significantly?

2. If the closure of MH contributed to the recovery of MRS, it is hard to evaluate the ILM peeling effect on the so called normal retina. Besides, to draw the conclusion that if the ILM peeling will affect the MRS of the retina surrounding the MH, the authors should compare the value at last follow-up to the data base or the fellow eye, rather than comparing to the preoperative values. Thus, it is hard to draw the conclusions that ILM peeling in normal retina will not decrease the retinal function in a short-term after surgery.

3. It is recommended to excluded the 2 patients who received two times surgeries. And the author should declare how many patients/eyes received phacovitrectomy. It is better to evaluate the MPS changes of patients received different surgical interventions separately.
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