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Author's response to reviews:

Nov. 6, 2015
Re: Manuscript 1107153785156928
Dear Ms April Rada and Dr Danielle Talbot PhD,

On behalf of my co-authors, thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript again. We greatly appreciate you very much for the revision comments on our manuscript. We have carefully considered all of the comments and suggestions, and have revised the manuscript accordingly. We really hope that the revised manuscript meets the editorial requirement. And we do hope that our manuscript will be accepted for publication in your journal. Here we would like to express our sincere gratitude to your hard work and constructive comments and suggestions.

Our point-by-point responses and answers to you are as follows.

Yours sincerely,
Nan Jiang, Guiqiu Zhao, Shanshan Yang, Jing Lin, Liting Hu, Chengye Che, Qian Wang, Qiang Xu
Department of Ophthalmology,
The Affiliated Hospital of Qingdao University, Qingdao, Shandong Province, China

The point-by-point responses to your comment are as follows:
1. Article type and Abstract.

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript as a research article. We have reformatted our manuscript with abstract and section titles according to the
BMC Ophthalmology style for a research article. In the section of abstract, we have added a brief description of the context of our study in subsection "Background". Please see the revised manuscript.

2. Ethical approval.

We have obtained approval from our institutional ethics committee to perform this retrospective study using clinical records, and to publish the results before submission to our journal, and the editors may request proof of ethical approval at any time. Besides, we have added the ethical approval from our institutional ethics committee in the section “Methods” of our manuscript. Please see the revised manuscript.

3. Consent.

Thanks for your suggestion! We have revised the part “Consent” to make it clear that we have obtained consent to publish images and data from 11 patients enrolled in our research. The editors may request proof of consent at any time.

4. Funding.

We have added the finding support of this article. Please see the part “Funding” in the revised manuscript.