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Dear editor,

We revised article according to reviewer’s comment as below:

Reviewer’s report
Title: Central macular thickness in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus without clinical retinopathy
Version: 3 Date: 21 November 2012
Reviewer: Alastair Denniston

Reviewer’s report:
The text is well-written and easy to read. The study is simple but effectively carried out, and pays attention to two key confounders of retinal thickness - refractive error and age.
Major compulsory revisions:
1. Conclusion in abstract should read: “Central macular thickness was not significantly thicker in patients with type 2 diabetes without clinical retinopathy than in healthy subjects.” The difference between the two groups is not statistically or clinically significant.

1-answer:

Conclusion: Central macular thickness was not significantly thicker in patients with type 2 diabetes without clinical retinopathy than in healthy subjects.

2. VA recorded as 0.0 in text but 1.0 in Table 1. I assume that the correct answer is 0.0 (LogMAR).

2, answer:
Best corrected vision (BCVA) was 0.00 (log MAR) in both groups.

Table 1.

| BCVA        | 0.00 (log MAR) | 0.00 (logMAR) | NS          |

Minor Essential Revisions
3. Non-significant P values for Table 3 need to be consistent ie you either need to put NS or put the exact p values for both study and control groups.
3. answer: revised as NS in table 3.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
Reviewer's report

Title: Central macular thickness in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus without clinical retinopathy
Version: 3 Date: 14 January 2013
Reviewer: Samer Elsherbiny

Reviewer's report:
Interesting and useful article.
Minor Essential Revisions:
1. A few spelling mistakes and grammatical errors noted. Answer: Was corrected in the text.
2. Table 1 mislabelled item "Logmar: minimum angle of HbA1c". revised as: logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution
3. Please clarify in table 3 what is "r" and what is "p" : explained below the table 3:

p: statistic value, r: relation between two variables.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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