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Dr. Eleni Papageorgiou
Executive Editor
BMC Ophthalmology
11 September 2015

Dear Dr. Papageorgiou,

Thank you for your helpful review of our manuscript “Retinal hemorrhages following fingolimod treatment for multiple sclerosis; a case report” (BOPH-D-15-00016).

We have corrected all points as suggested by the reviewers and have outlined each in the following point-by-point discussion. All changes are in red font in the revised manuscript.

We hope our revised manuscript is improved and is now acceptable for publication in BMC Ophthalmology.

Please note that written informed consent was obtained from the patient’s mother for publication of this case report and accompanying images. Because the patient and his mother could not understand English, we have translated your English consent form into Japanese, and then obtained written consent in Japanese. This can be provided to the journal.

Thank you for your consideration of our manuscript.

Sincerely,

Naoko Ueda

Naoko Ueda
Response to Reviewers

We replaced “gaze-related nystagmus” with “gaze-evoked nystagmus” (p4. line10) and “acuity did not decrease consciously” with “did not decrease considerably” (p4. line13).

Specific Request by the Editor:

Ethics Committee Approval:

The name of the committee that approved our study was added to the Ethics approval section of the manuscript on p.8 line 6—7.

Consent Section:

Concerning patient consent, written informed consent was obtained from the patient’s mother for publication of this case report and accompanying images. Because the patient and his mother could not understand English, we translated your English consent form into Japanese, and obtained the patient’s consent in Japanese.

When we revised last time on 30 August 2015, we attached a copy of the consent form on the last page of our letter. However, that attached copy of the consent form disappeared after we moved the letter to contribute the manuscript to BMC Ophthalmology. So, when we accepted the second review of our manuscript on 4 September 2015, we replied to ask how to attach a copy of the consent form. We attached a copy of the consent form and ethics approval in the reply to that email.

Authors’ contributions:

We changed the ‘Authors’ Contributions’ to include more detail on p.8 lines19–20 and p.9 lines1—3.
We checked our revised manuscript again to conform to your journal style.