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Dear Editor-in-Chief:

Enclosed please find the revised version of our manuscript “Peripapillary choroidal thickness in healthy Chinese subjects” (MS: 1549739082873232).

We appreciate your supportive comments and the Reviewers’ thoughtful and constructive critiques, which had been extremely helpful in our revision. We have carefully read comments and suggestions and revised our manuscript accordingly. All the modifications have been highlighted in blue in the revised manuscript, which we believe that the article is thereby strengthened. In addition, our point-by-point responses to the comments and suggestions are listed below.

Thank you again for your further consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely yours,
Xiulan Zhang, MD, PhD

Professor of Ophthalmology
Vice Director of Glaucoma Department
Director of Clinical Research Center
Director of Institution of Drug Clinical Trials
Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center
State Key Laboratory of Ophthalmology
Sun Yat-sen University
54S. Xianlie Road, Guangzhou 510060, P.R. China.
Email: zhangxl2@mail.sysu.edu.cn
Tel: +86-20-87330484
Fax: +86-20-87333271
EDITORIAL BOARD COMMENTS:
This is a nice paper about assessment of choroidal thickness in a healthy sample from Chinese population. The study design, conduct and type of analysis are sound. I have no particular comments but the ones that are following:
Thank you for your great comments! Our answers are as follows:

- Complete reference number 4.
  We thank the reviewer for the careful reading of our manuscript. This error has been fixed in the revised manuscript.

- Methods: patients with mild to moderate cataract could be enrolled in the study. Please state clearly that this did not compromise the quality of the OCT images.
  We thank you for kindly highlighting this point. In this study, patients with severe cataract that compromise the quality of the OCT images were excluded. Only high-quality images were included.

- Methods: did the authors assess the reproducibility of the measurements? If not please mention and discuss.
  We are really grateful for raising this critical point. This is one potential limitation of our study. However, in a recent study Ehrilich and colleagues reported that Lin’s concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) for peripapillary choroidal thickness measurement was 0.93 (P < 0.001) [16]. The measurements were extremely reproducible.
  We have stated this in the discussion part.

- Methods: were all the measurements taken by the same evaluator? If not please mention and discuss.
  Thank you for your query.
  The choroid was measured by two independent graders. If the thickness difference measurements of the two examiners exceeded 15% of the mean of the two values, there was open adjudication with the senior author and then averaged for analysis.
  As suggested, we have mentioned this in the methods part.