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Response to Reviewer Comments

Both reviewers were very supportive of the manuscript. One reviewer suggested some minor changes which are dealt with on a point by point basis

1. The authors should be consistent in their use of the term “artery” and “arteriole”. It seems that they are used interchangeably.

We have now standardised on “arteriole” throughout the manuscript.

2. In the Results, it would be helpful to state how many eyes were actually used to comprise “n”. Were multiple arterioles from the same eye used? Also was the same arteriole used in multiple experiments?

This has been clarified by the following addition to the methods section.

“Typically, two arterioles were harvested from each eye.” And “A fresh arteriole was used for each experiment.”

In the statistics section we now state that “The n number refers to the number of arterioles.”

3. I would suggest the use of standard deviation should be used as opposed to standard error in the description of the data.

We have not followed this suggestion in order to remain consistent with most authors in this field and to maintain continuity with our previous publications.

4. The authors should consider combining Figs 2 and 3 because the effects of bevacizumab would be easier to appreciate (blunted vasodilatation at concentrations above 100 nm). For example, different coloured symbols and lines could be used for the two sets of data.

We appreciate the suggestion to allow easier comparison of the data with and without bevacizumab. It was not possible to combine the two figures because the x-axis needs to be different. However, we have achieved the same objective by reproducing the relevant part of the bevacizumab free data in Figure 4.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published.

We have improved the manuscript wherever we felt that the language used was not optimal.

We also moved the methods section after looking at current issues of the journal. There appears to be an error in the BMC Ophthalmology Guidelines which indicate that the methods should be at the end of the manuscript. This required re-ordering the figures with Figure 4 becoming Figure 1 and Figure numbers 1, 2, and 3 increasing by one.