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Dear Editor,

Enclosed please find the revised manuscript, "High-dose antioxidants for central serous chorioretinopathy; The randomized, placebo-controlled study", for re-consideration for publication in "BMC Ophthalmology". This study has not been published elsewhere.

The research was approved by our Ethics Committee, Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University on December 2004 (EC 47/362-023), and before the enrollment, all patients signed the consent forms. The research has also registered in the www.ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT 00963131). We did not have financial support from any industrial company for this study.

We also included the responses to the editor and reviewers comments as follow,

The responses to editor comments
Correction 1; The authors contribution has been corrected.

The responses to reviewer 1 comments (Catherine Meyerle)
Minor essential revisions
Comment 1; The reviewer suggested to remove the sentence about cystoid macular edema (page 10) from the discussion part to the results section.
Response & answer; We removed the sentence and provided this information in the results section (page 7-8, as underlined sentences).
Comment 2; The reviewer suggested a final English correction.
Response & answer; We have sent the whole revised manuscript again to our English consultant of the Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University.

The responses to reviewer 2 comments (Michael Marmor)
Comment 1 and 2; The reviewer asked about the FA leakage patterns and suggested to show them in Table 1.
Response & answer; We already described the FA leakage patterns in Table 1(at baseline) and Table 2 (at 3rd month) to show how many cases of inkblot and smokestack leakages in each group. The distribution of the FA leakage patterns were similar in both groups.
Comment 3; The reviewer asked about the 10 resistant cases of fluid and/or leakage.
   Response & answer; We described in the results part (page 8, as underlined sentence) that the leakage patients and the patients with slower fluid resolution at 3rd month were the same group.
Comment 4; The reviewer need comments about the reasons for resistant cases.
   Response & answer; In discussion part (page 11-12, as underlined sentences) we tried to explain possible causes of the resistant cases such as the different in patients’ personality, stress, smoking, or even oxidative stress. However, we also emphasized the oxidative process as the cause of the condition because it was our main study objective.
Comment 5; The reviewer suggested a final English correction.
   Response & answer; We have sent the whole revised manuscript again to our English consultant of the Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University. The page-12 sentences were also corrected (as underlined).
Comment 6; The reviewer suggested to show the picture of inkblot leakage instead of smokestack leakage.
   Response & answer; We changed the picture to the inkblot leakage, that was typical for CSC.
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