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Dear Editor

I have done the necessary corrections on the paper; here you can see all the comments that I have made.

1. Page 3, line 8? 10: Replace? Visual outcome, slit lamp biomicroscopy, intraocular pressure (IOP), and posterior segment Visualization by indirect ophthalmoscopy was evaluated. Orbital radiography, AB mode ultrasonography, and computed orbital tomography were also performed for all cases? To? Main outcomes were recorded including anatomic and visual outcomes, IOP, and both intraoperative and postoperative complications?

The related sections were reviewed.

2. Page 3, line 12: Replace? IOFBs? To? IOFBs (size range, 3 to 12 mm)?

The detail was inserted.

3. Page 3 & page 11? Anatomical results? And? Postoperative complications? : For the eye with phthisis bulbi, we cannot expect that the retina was attached nor can call the case as anatomical? Success?

Our mistake was corrected in related paragraphs.

4. Page 4, line 1: Remove? Silicone oil was injected Silicone oil was injected? form key words.

Our mistake was corrected in related section.

5. Page 10, line 11? 13: The meaning of the sentence? Ten patients (%27,8) final visual acuity were in better visual acuity group than preoperative values? is not clear. Which group do the authors mean? The grouping is different between Table 3 and Table 4.

Dear reviewer this sentences has been revised. The sentence was the summarize of table 3.


The mistake was corrected.


The mistake was corrected.
8. Page 14, line 12: Why? 3.6?? In the result section, the authors said the mean size of IOFB was 5.63 mm (312 mm).

The mistake was corrected.

9. Table 4 & page 10 line 3: In this table I assume the operated eyes were divided into two groups that are? <20/200? and ?>20/200?. In the group with baseline BCVA >20/200 (n=22), final BCVA in 2 eyes were <20/200. Therefore, this table indicates that visual acuity in the 2 eyes declined after surgery. This is Contradictory to the statement in the result section (page 10 line 13) that? No worsening on visual acuity in any patients.?

Dear Reviewer we actually realized that however even there is a decrease from 22 to 20 at the >20/200 group there are 2 additional patient from <20/200 group so the total number was the same. However we decided to remove the related misunderstanding from the passage.

10. Table 4: There is only one P value in table 4. On which association the P value indicates significance?

All p values was inserted.

11. Table 5: Lokalizayonu? Should be? IOFB location?

The mistake was corrected.

12. Table 6: I assume the authors mean? IOL imp? Rather than? OIL imp? In the Surgical procedure section.

The mistake was corrected.

13. Reference 2, 7, 21, 24, 30, 32, 41: The style does not follow the journal protocol.

All references were revised.

14. Requesting for Copy-edit

A native speaker reviewed the paper.

Kindest Regards.

Ugur Celik