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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor, BMC Ophthalmology

We would like to thank you for the letter, and the opportunity to resubmit a revised copy of this manuscript. We would also like to take this opportunity to express our thanks to the reviewers for the positive feedback and helpful comments for correction and modification.

We believe have resulted in an improved revised manuscript, which you will find uploaded alongside this document. The manuscript has been revised to address the reviewer comments, which are appended alongside our responses to this letter.

As we know retinopathy of prematurity (ROP) refers to the developmental disorder of the retina in premature infants and is one of the most serious and most dangerous complications in premature infants. The incidence of ROP in Iran is different in various parts of Iran and its prevalence is reported to be 1–70% in different regions. This study aims to determine the incidence and risk factors of ROP in Iran. I want you to do us a favor and consider kindly our revised manuscript for publication in your very great academic journal.

All authors have read the revised manuscript and they are in agreement with its contents. Also, all authors declare no conflict of interests.

Dr. Milad Azami

On behalf of the authors
Reviewer reports:

Eduardo Villamor-Martinez, M.Sc., M.A. (Reviewer 1): I commend the authors for an excellent work in responding to my comments. I have two comments that were not fully addressed, and in particular the first point I would like to see addressed before publication. In addition, the English is much improved, but some language revision would still be ideal before final publication.

1. Figure 6, the meta-regression, is still missing a unit for the event rate (y-axis). Please label the y-axis.

The effect size based on logit event rate was calculated from the pooled results. The logit (logit event rate) function is the inverse of the sigmoidal "logistic" function or logistic transform used in mathematics, especially in statistics.

2. In addition, the authors only mention the p-value for the meta-regression. In order to get a clearer picture of its significance, the authors should add the coefficient and 95% confidence interval for the meta-regression, in the results sections and as part the figure. They should also mention the type of model used for the meta-regression. In it its current state, I believe this result lacks the necessary information for the reader to interpret it well.

Thanks dear reviewer for your attention, we add:

In method: the meta-regression model (method of moments) was carried out based on the year of studies (22).

In result: Meta-regression model in Figure 5 shows that the incidence of ROP is increasing according to the year of study, and this relationship is not statistically significant (meta-regression coefficient: 0.034, 95% CI -0.016 to 0.085, P= 0.181).

3. The author's mention that the PRISMA checklist is attached in the supplementary material. I could not find it in the supplementary material of the PDF I was sent, but this might be an issue with the document. If it is attached collectedly in the final version, then this is not an issue.

Please find attached file with entitled: PRISMA 2009 checklist

Editorial reports:
Most of the questions raised have been addressed. Please amend Figure 6 and provide the missing information requested by Reviewer 1.

Please, also make sure that you submit a current PRISMA checklist with page numbers filled in.

The checklist can be found at: http://prisma-statement.org/PRISMAStatement/Checklist.aspx

Thanks dear editor, we modified paper.