Apr 24th, 2022

Dear editor,

Please find attached files of revised manuscript in word format

First of all, thank you for your careful guidance of this article. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

Reviewer: 06253685

In this retrospective study, the authors analyzed and compared the efficacy, mechanism, and differences between two anti- VEGF drugs (compaq and ranibizumab) in DME patients, to provide a basis for clinical treatment. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures and tables are very good, and well discussed. The material studied allows to draw the conclusions. The description of material studied is accurate. I have a minor suggestion: The typical cases in Figures 3 still need to be carefully described in the Results section of the text. Thank you for giving opportunity to review your study.

Answer: The results in figure 3 were described in detail.

Reviewer's code: 06058906

I read the manuscript written by Yunfei Li and others with great interest. In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting and the retrospectively studies novel enough to attract the readers' attention. Nevertheless, the authors should clarify some points and improve the discussion citing relevant and novel key articles about the topic. The study is well designed and presented with optimal analysis, discussion, tabulation and graphic display of data. In general, the article provides an essential reference for researchers in this field and the

results are interesting and could be useful for other studies.

Answer: Thank you for your comments.

Reviewer's code: 06058797

The article with the title "Efficacy and mechanism of anti- vascular endothelial growth factor drugs for diabetic macular edema patients" is in generally well done. Title: Appropriate. It reflects the main content of the research. Autorship: Is correct. Institutions: are correct. Authors contribution is correct. Abstract: Is a structured abstract according to the required format. In 372 words authors showed a summary of the content of the manuscript. Key words: 6 that reflect the content of the study. Core Tip: In 90 words author reflect properly aspects that should call attention to the readers. Background: It is a retrospective study with a high importance for the clinical practice. Without effective treatment, vision declines rapidly, causing irreversible impairment in DME. Compaq has a strong affinity with VEGF receptors, and as a novel VEGF biological agent, it has a relatively strong inhibition of vascular growth in ocular lesions. Investigated the effect and mechanism of anti- VEGF drugs in DME patients is needed in order to improve clinical DME treatment. Results: This study showed that before and 1 mo post-treatment, there was no statistical difference in CMT, SFCT, or FAZ level between the two groups. Three months post-treatment, the estimated values of CMT and SFCT in the compaq group were significantly lower than those in the ranibizumab group. Discussion: Authors made a detailed an informative discussion of the results. Illustrations: They show 3 figures and 7 tables with their corresponding legend. All figures and tables are showing clearly making and adequate support of the results. However, I have a little doubt, it didn't find table 6, is it lost? Biostatistics: This work met the requirements of biostatistics. References: Authors cited properly actualized references of high interest for their propose in introduction and discussion Organization of the study: It was properly organized Research method reporting. As a retrospective study it has been reported according with

the corresponding guidelines.

Answer: Thank you. The tables were carefully checked and the manuscript has been revised accordingly. In addition, we compared the latest research progress in this field with the research results.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Diabetes.

Sincerely Yours,

Qian Ren