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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This prospective study evaluated the structural outcomes of IVA injection in the treatment of severe posterior ROP with significant FVP and the author concluded that when the IVA injection is given prior to 37 weeks PMA, while disease is in phase 2, it is less likely to cause contracture of pre-existing FVP. Questions/suggestions for the authors. 1. The criteria for choosing between the two different drugs, 0.625 mg of bevacizumab or 0.2 mg of ranibizumab, need to be indicated. It looks like the majority of eyes received 0.625 mg of bevacizumab as the authors stated “Thirty two eyes (89%) received 0.625 mg of intravitreal bevacizumab and 4 eyes (11%) received 0.2 mg of intravitreal ranibizumab (0.2mg)”. 2. Were both drugs injected once? Why would some patients need additional dose of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)? What was the additional drug? 3. It would help the readers tremendously if the authors could clearly present their results in tables.
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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There is no benefit to obtain new knowledge from this study but the result would lead to suggestion for a big data collection from registration or multi-center observation study. Please recheck grammar and typing errors.