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Author's response to reviews:

Dr Christopher Gadd
Assistant Editor
BMC Journals
Re: Submission of the revised manuscript no MS: 1153700457370693, entitled "Comparative evaluation of diode laser versus argon laser photocoagulation in patients with central serous retinopathy: A prospective, randomized clinical trial"

Dear Dr. Gadd,
Enclosed please find the revised copy of the above mentioned manuscript for consideration for publication in your journal. The manuscript has been revised as per the suggestions of the reviewers and has been highlighted. The article has also been formatted as per the format of the journal and as per your suggestions.
I hope the paper now fulfils the requirements for publication in your esteemed journal.
Thanking you
With warm regards
Yours sincerely,

Lalit Verma

Response to referees' comments
Referee 1
1. As suggested by the reviewer, the contact lens used to perform laser has mentioned in the manuscript (Page 7, Para 3, Lines 3-4).

2. As suggested by the reviewer, the number of laser spots applied in the two groups has now been mentioned in the manuscript (Page 8, Para 1, Lines 4-6).

3. As suggested by the reviewer, the name of the visual acuity chart has been mentioned in the manuscript (Page 6, Para 2, Line 5).

4. As suggested by the reviewer, the typographical error on page 9 (earlier page 8) has been corrected (Page 9, Para 1, Line 2).

Referee 2
1. As suggested by the reviewer, the title of the manuscript has been changed to "A pilot randomized controlled trial" (Page 1 - title).

2. As it was a project undertaken at our institute, we had taken approval of the Institute body local ethics committee and the same has been added in the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer (Page 6, Para 2, Lines 2-3).

Referee 3
1. As suggested by the reviewer, the p-values of the results has been included in the
Abstract (Page 2, Para 4, Lines 4-5, 7, Page 3, Para 1, Lines 1-2).

2. As suggested by the reviewer, the typographical error on page 9 (earlier page 8) has been corrected (Page 9, Para 1, Line 2).

3. As suggested by the reviewer, the grammatical errors, wherever present in the manuscript have been corrected.

4. As suggested by the reviewer, the p-values from the Discussion have been deleted.

5. As suggested by the reviewer, the statement regarding diode laser being effective in preventing recurrence of CSR has been omitted from the discussion.

The manuscript has also been formatted as per the format of the journal.