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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions:

Abstract:
1. Last line, page 2. Sentence.....correlated with age and most were positively correlated...should be ..most of them..
2. Add that boys had thicker macula than girls also in the abstract

Methods:
3. Routine check-up - What was that? There must have been some reason for the children to come to the ophthalmology department. Please explain and clarify.
4. Regarding the different subfields of macular thickness I think there should be some explanation to the EDTRS-areas A1-9.

Results:
5. Did the authors do one measurement in each eye only?
6. Regarding macular thickness, the inner circle was significantly thicker than central macula. Which statistical analysis was used? I cannot find it in statistical methods.

Discussion:
7. I do not think that the authors should start a sentence with an abbreviation, OCT and SD-OCT.
8. Write examination instead of exam.
10. Page 14. I think the second last sentence before conclusion should be “our study was hospital-based and not population-based”

Figure:
11. Unit is missing for both macular and RNFL thickness (µm) and also for frequency (%).
12. Regarding macular thickness, please write 280 instead of 280.0 and so on. Tables 4 and 5.
13. If the authors prefer the shaded rows they should explain it in the Tables
instead of in the Discussion. However, it might be better with an extra column referring to TD or SD-OCT instead of the shade.
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