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A Cover Letter to Editor

Dear Ms Erica Cruz

Thank you so much for your E-mail letter dated April 1st, 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). We deeply appreciate the referees’ scholarly review. We have modified the manuscript to directly address all of the comments of the reviewers and carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical and bibliographical errors.

Enclosed please find our response to the reviewers’ comments (below) and the revised manuscript for reconsideration of publication in BMC Ophthalmology.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Hongping Cui, PhD, MD

Responses to Reviewer Hyong Kwon Kang

Dear Hyong Kwon Kang,

Thank you for taking the time to review this paper.

We have addressed all of your comments, as described in point-by-point response below.

Overall comment:
1) We have carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical and bibliographical errors and removed unnecessary repetition.
2) It was noticed that in the study of Shukla et al some patients with both MHs and peripheral breaks were included and the axial lengths of the patients are normal. We appreciated the reviewer’s comment, so we excluded the study of Shukla and made a meta-analysis with the remainder 6 studies. After re-analysis, a litter data of the result changed but the conclusion was not affected.
3) We have noticed that there are some mistakes in Figures 2-5. The positions of “Favours VT with ILMP” and “Favours VT without ILMP” are opposite in the forest plot. We have modified the Figure 2-5.

Specific comments:
1) We have corrected the word misspelt in line 92, page 3.
2) We have change it into “. was used” according to the reviewer’s advice.
3) We have corrected it according to the reviewer’s suggestion.
4) It was not specially stated by the authors that the continuous data being presented in median and range values was non-parametric.
5) The first sentence in line 152, page 4 was revised and the word ‘myopic’ was deleted.
6) It has been changed into ‘pars plana vitrectomy’.
7) Yes, we have deleted the suggestion that ILM peeling increased the incidence of postoperative complications.
8) We have deleted the sentence which deal with the same point and adjusted it for better understood.
9) We have corrected the sentence by changing the word ‘exhibited’ to ‘existed’ in line 225, page
Responses to Reviewer Takashi Ueta

Dear Takashi Ueta,

I am very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. According with your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. Some of your comments were responded below.

Major compulsory revisions
1) We have explain the abbreviations of ‘OR’, ‘CI’, and ‘WMD’ at the first appearance in the part of abstract.
2) We have corrected the ‘responsible author’ to ‘corresponding author’ in line 97 for better understanding.
3) We have added the information of gas tamponade agents, type of dye for ILM stained and follow-up duration in the results section. And in our study we included the research on only MHs. Studies which included patients with peripheral breaks were excluded.
4) We have corrected the ‘peeling1’ to ‘peeling’. It was considered that OR, 95%CI and p value are routine index of meta-analysis. It can be understood by majority of specialist reader with no more explanation.
5~7) We have noticed that there are some mistakes in Figures 2-5. The positions of “Favours VT with ILMP” and “Favours VT without ILMP” are opposite in the forest plot. We have modified the Figure 2-5.

Minor essential revisions

We also carefully proof-read the manuscript and modified some typographical, grammatical and bibliographical errors.

We sincerely appreciate your insightful and constructive comments and suggestions. We believe that these have greatly strengthened the paper.

Thank you again for taking the time to review this paper.

Sincerely

Hongping Cui, PhD, MD
1) We have added a space in ‘planavitrectomy’.
2) The word ‘it’ has been changed in ‘if’.
3) The word ‘include’ in Figure1 has been corrected into ‘included’.

We also carefully proof-read the manuscript and modified some typographical, grammatical and bibliographical errors.

We sincerely appreciate your insightful and constructive comments and suggestions. We believe that these have greatly strengthened the paper.

Thank you again for taking the time to review this paper.

Sincerely

Hongping Cui PhD, MD