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TO THE EDITOR

Epidemiology and treatment outcomes of diabetic retinopathy in a diabetic population from Cameroon.

Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewer for his careful reading of our manuscript and for his helpful comments and suggestions. We have made changes accordingly and we believe that the result is a greatly improved paper. All the new changes are marked in blue in the revised version. Our point-by-point replies to reviewer are below. We are most grateful for the opportunity to publish our manuscript in *BMC Ophthalmology* and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jean Jacques N. Noubiap, MD
Internal Medicine Unit, Edéa Regional Hospital, Edéa, Cameroon
Phone: +237 93637748; Email: noubiapjj@yahoo.fr

Reviewer’s Comment 1

Abstract

Line 2, please correct the aim of the study to “the aim of this study”

Authors’ Response 1

Thank you. This has been corrected

Reviewer’s Comment 2

Introduction

- Line 13 paragraph 2, please correct neorevascularization to “neovascularization”

Authors’ Response 2

Thank you. This has been corrected.
Reviewer’s Comment 3

This is a hospital based study, therefore, the term “prevalence” may not be so accurate to use, please change to “frequency of” as “prevalence” can only be assessed in community based studies.

Authors’ Response 3

Thank you for this suggestion. We have replaced “prevalence” with “frequency”.

Reviewer’s Comment 4

In the study design, the author states from October to October, does this mean first of October 2004 to 30th of September 2006 ?? if so, please change the sentence to be “from October 2004 through September 2006”.

Authors’ Response 4

Thank you. We have made the requested change.

Reviewer’s Comment 5

Data Analysis: Please change mean with SD to Mean and standard deviation. Also please change qualitative variables to categorical variables as they are not qualitative data.

Authors’ Response 5

Thank you. We have made the requested changes.

Reviewer’s Comment 6

Results section:

The authors are dealing with analysis using a “per person” approach, this is quite good for prevention of blindness studies. However, at a certain point of analysis, a “per eye” approach should be used. The drawback of using a per person approach is not accounting for the difference between the eyes and the differential diagnosis per eye as well as the
difference in needed treatment. One of the resolutions for this situation is to provide a
guideline for how was a bilaterally affected patient treated or categorized ?? Otherwise, a
per eye detail should be presented.

Authors’ Response 6
Thank you for this concern. As suggested, we have provided a guideline for how was a
bilaterally affected patient treated or categorized.

Reviewer’s Comment 7
The authors mention that the Cameroon has a huge diversity in ethnicity, meanwhile, we
don’t see any information about whether this issue was taken into consideration in the
analysis or not? The reason behind this is the nowadays proves association between
genetics and hereditary factors and DR. given that the study is a prospective cohort, such
issues should have been covered well in the analysis.

Authors’ Response 7
We do agree with the reviewer comment. However, our study did not aim at assessing the
association between ethnicity and DR in our setting. Since this was not an objective of
our study, we did not collect the data needed to adequately address this issue.

Reviewer’s Comment 8
Discussion:
Please rephrase the sentence: collaborating with these reports to something like: in
agreement with these studies. Again, the same expression is not correct “a finding which
is collaborates” please consider English editing and terminology.

Authors’ Response 8
Thanks for the reviewer special effort to improve the form of our manuscript: the above
requested change has been made.
Reviewer’s Comments 9

Discussion:

Please rephrase the sentence: collaborating with these reports to something like: in agreement with these studies. Again, the same expression is not correct “a finding which is collaborates” please consider English editing and terminology.

Please also correct Khandekar study in Omam to Oman.

Also, at the end of the discussion (the patients leaving in rural, change to living in rural).

Please conduct a thorough English editing review.

Authors’ Response 9

Thanks for the reviewer special effort to improve the form of our manuscript: all the above requested changes have been made. A thorough English editing review has also been conducted and errors have been corrected.

Reviewer’s Comment 10

Conclusion:

As explained, using the term prevalence can’t be accurate for hospital based study, also, the authors build their main message on generalization of results to all Cameroon (prevalence is high in Cameroon) I would suggest decreasing the tone here, to something like, the prevalence may be high in Cameroon.

Authors’ Response 10

As suggested, the term “prevalence” has been replaced with “frequency”. We further changed the sentence “Our findings indicate a high frequency of DR among diabetic patients in Cameroon” with “Our findings indicate that the frequency of DR may be high among diabetic patients in Cameroon”. This change has been made in the abstract as well.