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Dear editor,

We revised article according to reviewer’s comments and required Editors’ Requests:

a- Reviewer’s comments and answers:

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 related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests

---

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare I have no competing interests

---

**b- The Required Editors’ Requests:**

Competing interests, Authors contributions and acknowledgements: added to article after conclusion as below:

Competing interests
The authors have no financial competing interests.

The authors have no non-financial competing interests.
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All authors conceived of and designed the experimental protocol. MD and EO contributed to the study design and did critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. MD, EO and BD participated in the eye examinations. EO and EC collected the data. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
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**Background:** To examine the central macular thickness in patients with type 2 diabetes without clinical retinopathy.

**Methods:** Optical coherence tomography (OCT) measurements were performed in 124 eyes of 62 subjects with diabetes mellitus without clinically retinopathy (study group: 39 female, 23 male, mean age: 55.06 ±9.77 years) and in 120 eyes of 60 healthy subjects (control group: 35 female, 25 male, mean age: 55.78 ± 10.34 years). Blood biochemistry parameters were analyzed in all cases. The data for central macular thickness (at 1 mm) and the levels of the fasting plasma glucose and glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) were compared in both groups.

**Results:** The mean central macular thickness was 232.12±24.41 µm in the study group and 227.19± 29.94 µm in the control group.
The mean HbA1c level was 8.92 ± 2.58% in the study group and 5.07 ± 0.70% in the control group (p=0.001). No statistically significant relationship was found between CMT, HbA1c, and fasting plasma glucose level in either group (p=0.05).

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

**Key words**: diabetes mellitus, central macular thickness, glycosylated hemoglobin, fasting plasma glucose level.

This study is not reports the results of a controlled health care intervention.
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