Author's response to reviews

Title: Prevalence and progression of visual impairment in patients newly diagnosed with clinical type 2 diabetes: a 6-year follow up study

Authors:

Niels de Fine Olivarius (olivarius@sund.ku.dk)
Volkert Siersma (siersma@sund.ku.dk)
Gitte Juul Almind (gittejuul@gmail.com)
Niels Vest Nielsen (nvn@dadlnet.dk)

Version: 3 Date: 4 January 2011

Author's response to reviews: see over
To the editors of BMC Public Health

Resubmission of the manuscript “Prevalence and progression of visual impairment in patients newly diagnosed with clinical type 2 diabetes: a 6-year follow up study”

Thank you for inviting us to resubmit our manuscript to BMC Public Health. I regret that it has taken us so long to answer to the remaining simple question from the statistical reviewer.

Below please find our reply in New Times Roman and blue. Additions to the manuscript are indicated with yellow. As the changes are so very few, we have not attached a marked copy of the manuscript. The only changes made in the manuscript are indicated below with yellow.

We are looking forward to your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Niels Olivarius

Niels de Fine Olivarius
Professor of General Medicine, MD BSc
Assistant Research Director
The Research Unit for General Practice
Department of Public Health
Faculty of Health Sciences
University of Copenhagen
Øster Farimagsgade 5
P. O. Box 2099
DK-1014 Copenhagen
Denmark
TEL +45 3532 7171
DIR +45 3532 7160
MOB +45 6130 8547
FAX +45 3532 7131
olivarius@sund.ku.dk
www.fe.ku.dk

Reviewer's report
Title: Prevalence and progression of visual impairment in patients newly diagnosed with clinical type 2 diabetes: a 6-year follow up study
Version: 2 Date: 27 November 2010
Reviewer: Kåre I. Birkeland
Reviewer's report:
By large, the authors have appropriately addressed and answered the major and minor objections I had.
Thank you.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests
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**Title:** Prevalence and progression of visual impairment in patients newly diagnosed with clinical type 2 diabetes: a 6-year follow up study

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 22 November 2010

**Reviewer:** Stian Lydersen

**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have satisfactorily addressed my comments, with one minor exception:

You state "To account for multiple statistical testing, we applied the method of Benjamini-Hochberg [28] on the p-values in Table 5, and found that a significance level of 0.0179 was to be used in order to control the false discovery rate at 5%.

It is not clear to me how you did this. Did you for example apply the procedure of equation (1) in Benjamini-Hochberg [28] to one of the four columns of 28 p-values in Table 5? Please explain this in the manuscript or in the letter accompanying your revision.

We indeed applied the procedure of equation 1 in Benjamini-Hochberg (1), but we applied it on all the four columns of 28 p-values in Table 5 (4x28=112 p-values). All (nominal) p-values in Table 5 that are 0.0179 or lower are to be considered significant to have a false discovery rate of 5% or lower. We have now made this clear in the manuscript:

“To account for multiple statistical testing, we applied the method of Benjamini-Hochberg (1) on all the four columns of p-values in Table 5, i.e. 4 x 28 = 112 p-values, and found that a significance level of 0.0179 was to be used in order to control the false discovery rate at 5%.”

Though the p-values in Table 5 cannot be assumed to be independent, the procedure still adequately controls for the false discovery rate (at 5%) when the p-values are (positively) dependent as described in the following reference: Benjamini Y, Yekutieli D (2001). "The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency". Annals of Statistics 29: 1165–1188.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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