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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Ms Cruz,

Thank you so much for your E-mail dated Dec 29th, 2014, regarding our manuscript entitled “Vitrectomy with Internal Limiting Membrane Peeling vs no Peeling for Macular Hole-induced Retinal Detachment (MHRD): a Meta-analysis” (MS: 3903885971551032). According with your advice, we have modified our manuscript. All changes were described below point by point.

1) Acknowledgments:
We have provided an Acknowledgments section in our manuscript. Because this study was completed by our research team independently so we mentioned in this section “we did not have someone or group to acknowledge to”.

2) Requesting ethics statement:
Our research was a second study of published literatures and it did not involved human subjects. So we didn’t give a statement in the Methods section of our manuscript.

3) Requesting for consent statement
Because our research was a second study of published literatures, no participants joined in our study. So we didn’t give a written informed consent for participants in the Methods section of our manuscript.

4) Requesting for Line Number
We have added the line and page numbers in our manuscript.

5) Requesting for Figure legends
According to your request, we added the figure legends at the end of the document and removed all the figures in the main manuscript.

We sincerely appreciate your insightful and constructive suggestions. We are looking forward the peer review process of our manuscript.

Thank you again for taking the time to review this paper.
Sincerely
Hongping Cui
Department of Ophthalmology
Shanghai East Hospital, Tongji University, P.R.China