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Author's response to reviews: see over
Referee 1:
Major revisions:
1) Abstract and elsewhere. Is most immunisation only PBS or "mock antiserum" as stated elsewhere - perhaps they are the same thing? If so then would be easier to define once and keep that consistent. The term “mock” is now better defined (Page 6 line 5).

2) Abstract - results - I think some data should be included in the results section not just p-values. Numerical data were added to the results section of the abstract (Page 2 lines 17 – 23; Page 3 lines 1 – 5).

Minor revisions:
1) Minor: Methods - please state more directly that ethics was approved for the use of animals. A new section entitled “Model” was added to the methods to more clearly state the ethics approval of animal use (Page 5 lines 18 – 23).

2) The referee suggested an alternate explanation for MPO activity versus CFU recovered from the vitreous. A sentence was added to the discussion regarding this point (Page 14 lines 19 – 21).

Referee 2:
Minor revisions:
1) The Methods and Results sections can be shortened by including references as necessary. References were used to shorten the Methods and Results sections.

2) The discussion is redundant at places. Authors are advised to provide succinct discussion of their results. Redundant data was removed from the discussion.