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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is well written and clear

In this small initial pilot study the authors found that the use of Conbercept at the end of surgery had no effect on any of the outcomes tested. Although a pilot study I think details of masking of outcomes, reasons for the small sample size chosen as well as randomisation methods should be included. Similarly as a non powered pilot I think the conclusions of lack of effect cant really be stated - the study showed no adverse effects and could be used to power a definitive study but I dont think the authors can be so definitive about their conclusions as they are - especially regarding early POVCH.

The authors could usefully report more on their findings in the few patients with late POVCH - was high frequency ultrasound performed to look for sclerostomy ingrowth or sclerostomy ingrowth seen during re-operation? - see Entry site neovascularization and vitreous cavity hemorrhage after diabetic vitrectomy. The predictive value of inner sclerostomy site ultrasonography. Ophthalmology. 2008 Mar;115(3):525-32 and Entry site treatment to prevent late recurrent postoperative vitreous cavity haemorrhage after vitrectomy for proliferative diabetic retinopathy. Br J Ophthalmol. 2010 Sep;94(9):1219-25 - both articles provide data on the causes of late POVCH and why a lack of effect may not be seen with anti Vegfs at end of surgery.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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