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Dear editor:
Thank you for your comments, we have revised the manuscripts point by point

Review1

1) I would consider simplifying the title. Omitting the words "main", "registered" and "during" might be appropriate.
Answer: Yes, we have omitting the words "main", "registered"" during"

2) In the results section of the abstract it says: "Age can significantly affect prevalence..." where I would prefer "Age significantly affects prevalence..."
Answer: Yes, we have revised it

3) The authors use two digits after the decimal point in most cases. I think one would suffice. For example, writing that the mean age is 70.66 is irrelevant. 70.7 is better. Similarly, to say that the 14.5% of blindness is caused by MMD when you only have 15 cases, is better than 14.50%
Answer: Yes, we have revised it in all manuscript

4) In the beginning of the second paragraph in the Background section, the name "Shanghai" appears three times in a row. I would consider rephrasing
Answer: Yes, we have revised it

5) In the Results section, first paragraph, where it is says "Gender was not a significant factor (P>0.05)"..." I would prefer not to have the p-value.
Answer: Yes, we have revised it.

Review2

Abstract: Results – the increase in blindness could have been due to better
reporting. The authors should not call it ‘prevalence’ as it is not a population-based study, but rather ‘reported prevalence’ or ‘reported blindness’

Answer: because the registry in the present study is not depend on self report, and every one apply for blind ID should be pass a certification examination. So it should not be call ‘reported prevalence’ or ‘reported blindness’ i think.

Yes, I have revised it

Page 4 Methods: Para 3 last sentence – it is ‘retinitis pigmentosa’ not ‘pigment retinitis’.
Yes, it should be retinitis pigmentosa

Why were these 3 years interval only was taken. Some justification for that should be written.
Answer: blind identification was not performed at any time. When the number of patients applying for blind increased to a certain quantity (usually more than 100), the blind identification will be performed. The blind identification time will across years. So we calculate the 3 year incidence.
We have revised it.

Page 7 Results: 1st para prevalence word cannot be used as registry depends
Answer: because the registry in the present study is not depend on self report, and every one apply for blind ID should be pass a certification examination. So it should not be call ‘reported prevalence’ or ‘reported blindness’

2 Para: ‘new blindness’ – omit ‘new’.
Answer: we have revised

Only single decimal place for reporting figures.
Answer: we have revised

In discussion authors themselves admit that increase is due to better registration rather than increase in levels of disease. This should be highlighted as a limitation of the ‘registry’ method.
Mention ‘prevalence as per registry’ rather than ‘prevalence’.
Answer: this is a limitation

Answer: yes, we have revised it

Page 10: 2nd para: Do not repeat results, Shorten discussion.
Answer: yes, we have revised it
Page 12: Use 'registered blind' rather than prevalence.
Answer: yes, we have revised it

Thank you
Liangcheng wu
Xinghuai sun