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Dear Editor of BMC ophthalmology (c/c Ms April Rada)

Thank you for your e-mail dated 29 September 2015. We were pleased to know that our manuscript was suitable for publication (not yet accepted).

Based on the instructions provided in your e-mail, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript in MS word on the journal’s website.

As you notice, we have revised some parts of our manuscript according to the CARE checklists and indicated each item to the corresponding parts of the text. And also we provide a cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the comments raised by the editor based on the E-mail dated 12 August 2015. We would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers and editor who identified areas of our manuscript that needed corrections or modifications.

We would like also to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript.

I hope that the revised manuscript will be accepted for publication in BMC ophthalmology.

Sincerely Yours,

Sang-Bumm Lee, MD/PhD
Yeungnam University College of Medicine
Department of Ophthalmology
170, Hyunchung-ro, Nam-gu, Daegu,42415, Rep of KOREA

P.S.

1) We addressed the comments in a revised manuscript and provided a cover letter with a point-by-point description of the changes.

2) We also ensured that our revised manuscript conforms to the journal style.

3) We uploaded our cover letter including a point-by-point response and revised manuscript on the date of 5 October 2015.

Pont-by-Point Response

A. Response to the E-mail dated on 29 September 2015

Editorial Requirements:
*Complete the CARE checklist to indicate the page number where each item appears

--- We have revised some parts of our manuscript according to the CARE checklists and indicated each items to the corresponding parts of the text.
B. Response to the E-mail dated 12 August 2015 (We believe this response was already assessed by the editor)

Editorial comments

The authors have addressed most of the comments and modified the manuscript suitably. There are a few important points, however, those have not been adequately addressed and require attention. Please see my comments below.

1) Reviewer comment: MMC induced scleral defects can be covered with autologous scleral grafts or by partial thickness scleral flap rotational procedures where in graft vs. host disease can be prevented. Authors should make it clear the disadvantages of using autologous scleral tissue use in these cases.

Answer: For example, preserved homologous sclera is a flexible avascular tissue that causes minor immunologic reaction, and infectious disease transmission.

Editor comment: Autologous scleral tissue can be used to patch the sclera, and was used over the OCM. The reviewer is asking why this procedure alone or rotational procedures which use only autologous tissue (non-immunogenic) could not be used in the presented cases?

--- According to the comments of reviewer and editor, we revised the text as follows.

Autologous scleral tissue grafts or partial thickness scleral flap rotational procedures can be used to patch scleral defects, although these procedures potentially can damage the scleral tissue harvesting site, especially in elderly patients like in this study. Therefore the authors decided to try the new biomaterial instead of autologous scleral tissue to avoid additional scleral or ocular surface damage from the surgical procedure itself.

2) Line 33 reads 'All patients experienced loss of ocular discomfort and inflammation with rapidly stabilized ocular.'

Editor comment: Please change wording to 'Ocular discomfort and inflammation ceased in all patients as the ocular surface quickly stabilized.'

--- According to the comments of reviewer and editor, we revised the text as follows.

Ocular discomfort and inflammation ceased in both patients as the ocular surface quickly stabilized.

3) Conclusion

Reviewer comment: What were the preoperative signs pointing towards MMC induced scleral melt-provide in detail.

Editor comment: Here the reviewer is asking how the authors can be sure that the melting was MMC-induced in the present cases. It could be likely, but the authors only show an association and not a causative effect. Therefore, I suggest that the authors revise the text to indicate 'a possible MMC-associated thinning/melting'.

--- According to the comments of reviewer and editor, we revised the text as follows.

We revised the text to indicate 'a possible MMC-associated thinning' at the corresponding parts of the text.

4) Limitations - please also include as a limitation the specific indication for the OCM graft in this study, i.e., 'small scleral excavation without any underlying uveal ectactic change'.

--- According to the comments of reviewer and editor, we revised the text as follows.

Following sentence is added as a limitation. We believe the OCM graft applied in this study is appropriate only for patients with a small scleral excavation and no underlying uveal ectactic change.

5) Reviewer comment: Include patient perspective regarding OCM implant graft to complete this paper.
Editor comment: The reviewer is asking for the patients' subjective experience of the procedure - what is their view or opinion of the procedure and the outcome?

-- According to the comments of reviewer and editor, we revised the text as follows.

The patients’ perspective of OCM graft in this study was that both felt comfortable after reepithelialization, without ocular discomfort, ocular pain or severe foreign body sensation. Both were satisfied with their ocular surface cosmesis over the two years of observation.

6) This is a very small first case series, therefore please modify line 202 which reads 'In conclusion, our results suggest that the Ologen™ graft with CAU qualifies as a new, safe, easy,.' To read 'In conclusion, our results suggest that the Ologen™ graft with CAU is potentially a new, safe, easy,.'

-- According to the comment of editor, we did wording change as the editor suggested in the revised manuscript.

7) Requesting for Copy-Edit
We recommend that you ask a native English speaking colleague to help you copyedit the paper.

-- According to the comment of editor, we commissioned our Yeungnam University in professional language editing service.