

Response to reviewers

We thank you and the reviewers for your time and effort in providing feedback on our manuscript, and thank you for your insightful comments and valuable improvements to our paper. We have accepted the suggestions made by the reviewers and these alterations are highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript deals with an interesting and important point, the authors investigate the efficacy of laser photocoagulation combined with intravitreal injection of conbercept for treating DME. The topic has a clinical relevance. The manuscript is well written: the title reflects the main subject of the article, abstract and keywords well summarize the arguments. However, the title should summarize the core content of the manuscript, so that people may readily understand the key concepts and important findings presented within. Also, it's best not to use prepositional phrases, the current title needs to be modified. The methodology is described in detail and is well structured. The authors retrospectively compared clinical efficacy and seven indicator and incidence of adverse reactions. The results showed that intravitreal injection of conbercept combined with laser photocoagulation could be more effective in treating DME, shortening the treatment process, and reducing the level of cytokines in the eye. The discussion is well articulated according to results and the authors have clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. I think one of the advantages of this article is that it provides more ideas for DME therapy and it warrants further promotion. The tables are representatives and of good quality.

Reply: We appreciate it very much for this good suggestion. We did our best to improve the title and made changes to the manuscript. These changes do not affect the content and framework of the paper. We sincerely thank the reviewers for their

enthusiastic work and hope that the modification is approved..

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: At present, the etiology of diabetic macular edema is not completely clear, and its main clinical treatment strategy is laser photocoagulation of the retina under glycemic control. With the development of research, it is known that the development of DME is closely related to VEGF. Intravitreal injection of anti-VEGF drugs can rapidly improve the symptoms of DME, and has attracted clinical attention. So in this retrospective study, authors investigated the efficacy of intravitreal injection of conbercept combined with retinal laser photocoagulation in treating DR with macular edema and compared the effectiveness of conbercept injection based on laser photocoagulation in the treatment of DR. It also provides a new scheme for clinical treatment of DR with macular edema. I am very grateful to the article for its very detailed description of the therapeutic method, which is very helpful to clinicians. In addition to this, the results of the article are presented clearly and are discussed thoroughly by the authors. I suggest that the manuscript could be published in its present form.

Reply: We greatly appreciate your valuable comments on our manuscript. If there are any other modifications we could make, we would like very much to modify them and we really appreciate your help. Thank you again for your recognition of us, which will become the driving force for our next scientific research.