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Reviewer's report:

Thank you - the authors have made a comprehensive reply - but they omitted to include:

1) Rationale for sample size for this pilot- why 30 patients?

2) Details of masking - both assessments and also for the randomisation table - eg did the surgeons know what the next randomisation was going to be prior to surgery? - this could have introduced significance bias in terms of recruitment eg based on diseases activity rather than extent of NVs. Were the assessors masked to group?

3) When was randomisation done? - presumably at the completion of surgery just before injection (if in intervention group)? as patients requiring oil and long acting gas were excluded the authors should also describe the study as a pilot RCT in the abstract ie 'This was a pilot randomized study'. The words prospective and comparative, are superfluous as all RCTs are prospective and comparative, and a pilot RCT carries different significance to a fully powered RCT.

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.
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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.
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