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To
The Editorial Board of Journal of *BMC Ophthalmology*

Athens, 07/01/2015

Dear Editor,

I am sending for publication to your distinguished Journal the revised version of the manuscript entitled: “*Intravitreal cilium associated with retinal detachment 40 years following penetrating eye injury: a case report*”.

In this revision every effort was made to meet all your requirements and the reviewers’ comments.

Response to the reviewers’ comments

**Reviewer: Zisis Gatzioufas**

“The authors present an interesting, well-written case report, with high quality figures. I have no corrections to suggest.

An article of importance in its field”.

We would like to thank you for your encouraging comments and for the opportunity you give us to revise our work.

**Reviewer: Michael Tsatsos**

We would like to thank you for your comments that significantly helped us to improve our manuscript.

“*Line 58 The presence of cilia intraocularly has been rarely associated with penetrating eye injuries*”

The sentence was changed according to your suggestion.
“Line 68 We present the case of a cilium found in the vitreous cavity of a 79 year old caucasian female patient. We believe that the cilium in question entered in the vitreous cavity as a result of penetrating injury 40 years prior to the time of the vitrectomy. Other less likely ways of entry include phacoemulsification performed 2 years prior to beginning of symptoms or even during the pars plana vitrectomy.”

The paragraph was changed according to your suggestion.

“Line 83 There was no evidence of intraocular inflammation”

The sentence was changed according to your suggestion (new line 86).

“Lines 96-98 are repetitive”

The sentence was deleted according to your suggestion (new line 101).

“Line 106 Phacoemulsification is a possible way of foreign body introduction into the eye”

The sentence was changed according to your suggestion (new line 109).

“Line 128 Why was the rhegmatogenous RD associated with the cilium? Was there a retinal tear directly adjacent to the cilium?”

The phrase “intravitreal cilium was associated with rhegmatogenous retinal detachment” was deleted (new line 131). Furthermore, at lines 131-135 it is clarified that we do not propose that the cilium was the cause of retinal detachment.

**Reviewer: Georgios Panos**

“An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests”

We would like to thank you for your encouraging and thoughtful comments and for the opportunity you give us to revise our manuscript.
We hope that this revised paper would be appropriate for publication in BMC Ophthalmology.

Yours sincerely,

Dimitrios Brouzas MD, PhD