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Author’s response to reviews:

Point-by-point response to reviewers

1. Editor Comments:

The statistical analysis needs to be addressed, and the conclusion re-written.

Answer: Thanks for your advice. According to the suggestions, The statistical analysis had been redone and the conclusion had been re-written in the revised version.

BMC Ophthalmology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.
Reviewer reports:

Michele Lanza (Reviewer 2): The authors faced an interesting topic providing a comparison of methods to detect retinal lesions in patient undergoing LASIK surgery. After my evaluation I think there are needing some more modifications:

1) There is a bias in statistical evaluation: the authors included both eyes of same patient undergoing surgery. Like every other pair organ, both eyes of same person have an inner higher correlation, they can not be considered as single, independent ones. The authors should run again statistical evaluation using just one eye for patient or using compensatory statistical method usually adopted for pair organs.

Answer: Thanks a lot for the suggestion. one eye was randomly selected from each of 78 subjects for the study and the statistical analysis had been redone in the revised version.

2) The conclusion seem to state that both Goldmann examination and wide field SLO are needed in order to avoid to miss peripheral retinal lesions in these eyes. Your results show that SLO is not needed if a good Goldmann examination is performed. Lease rephrase the conclusion.

Answer: Thanks a lot for the comments. We felt very sorry that we did not clarify it clearly. The conclusion had been re-written according to your advise.

3) I deeply disagree with first sentence: myopia is not cancer or diabetes, simple myopia is not even a disease but a refractive defect, only a small percentage of myopic eyes evolve in pathologic myopia with could affect the style of life of people. Please, rephrase the first sentence.

Answer: Following your advice, we have replaced the first sentence by ” Myopia is the most common type of refractive error” in revised manuscript.