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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers

First of all thank you very much for your evaluation and reviewing. However, when there was only one reviewer at the first evaluation of the article, there is now a second reviewer. The second reviewer, Stinnett, said at the end of her review that she rejected the article. All evaluations of the reviewers have been answered.

Rasit Kilic (Reviewer 1): The manuscript has a positive results and it can provide additional information about RPE-Bruch membrane-choroid related disorders. it can be published, after a few corrections:

The conclusion in abstract is unrelated to the topic. It can be changed with a related sentence.

The conclusion in abstract has been rearranged.

Backround: The choroidal thickness change in different diseases such inflammatory disorders may be mentioned in the backgroud.

The choroidal thickness change in different diseases such inflammatory disorders have been mentioned in the background(lines 107-110)
Discussion: The topic in this manuscript is associated with choroidal thickness. Therefore, the last paragraph, as a conclusion, may be changed to emphasize the importance of thinner choroidal thickness in vitiligo patients.

The last paragraph, as a conclusion, has been changed to emphasize the importance of thinner choroidal thickness in vitiligo patients.

Sandra Stinnett (Reviewer 2):

1. First, there is something wrong with the spacing in this document. Many words run together with no spaces between them. This needs to be corrected.

   Answer 1: Spacing in the document has been corrected.

2. Also, some of the English has awkward phrasing. The use of commas in the numerical values in the tables is non-standard for English writing.

   Answer 2: English mistakes and punctuation marks on tables have been corrected.

3. The design of the study is not clear to me. The authors state the following at the end of the introduction:

   To shed light into the relevant literature, this study aims to evaluate the thickness of the choroid layer, where melanocytes are present densely, through thickness measurement using optical coherence tomography (OCT) and determine the correlation between choroidal thickness and disease severity in vitiligo.

   There is no mention that this is a comparison between patients with and without vitiligo. Yet in the methods, two groups are mentioned. So, there is a disconnect here.

   Answer 3: ‘Comparison between patients with and without vitiligo’ have been mentioned at the end of the background section.

4. It is not clear how patients were selected and how the two groups were chosen. The first sentence of the methods states the following:

   This prospective clinical study addresses the examination of the bilateral eyes of (154 eyes).

   In total, 77 patients'eyes were examined and served as controls.

   Then in line 132, they state the following:
Patients, who were diagnosed with vitiligo and were aged between 20-50 years, and healthy 133 adults with similar characteristics participated in this study.

So, who are the 77 patients mentioned in the first paragraph? If they are the controls, who are the 133 healthy adults who participated. And then how many patients with vitiligo participated? A flow diagram would help the reader understand this better. There needs to be a better description of who the patients and controls were and how there were selected.

Answer 4:

‘Patients, who were diagnosed with vitiligo and were aged between 20-50 years, and healthy 133 adults with similar characteristics participated in this study.’

I have reviewed the article again and I see that the above sentence is not like you mentioned it. Please re-check the methodology sentences.

Sentences of the methodology have been re-arranged and marked with highlighter.

5. The description of the "hand units" needs a reference or some better explanation. I don't know what they mean.

Answer 5: The meaning of "hand units" has been described in 136-140 lines.

6. The tables need work. In addition to the mean and standard deviation, the minimum, median, and maximum should be included. Also, present percentages along with numbers in each group for ease in comparing the groups. If you label a column as "p-value," you should not also put "P: xxxx" in the cells of that column. Otherwise, why would you label the column? This seems to be done for all except the first two entries in the first table. A footnote at the bottom of the table should indicate which tests were used for which variables. Use the same number of decimals for all p-values (3 is good).

Answer 6:

In addition to the mean and standard deviation, the minimum, median, and maximum have been included in table 2.

Percentages along with numbers in each group have been presented.

'P: xxxx' phrases were deleted.

Columns have been corrected.

A footnote at the bottom of the table has been indicated which tests were used for which variables.
The same number of decimals for all p-values have been used.

7. You do not need to interpret the correlations ('weak,' etc) for the readers in the table. Just present the correlations.

Answer 7: Interpretation sentences have been deleted.

8. Why are all the tables presented twice? Once they are highlighted and once they are not.

Answer 8: Double appearing tables have been corrected.

9. The results and conclusions are not well-motivated and reflect the confusion in the introduction. Is the point of the study to compare patients with and without vitiligo? Or is it to discuss the choroid only in the patients who have vitiligo. It seems like a mixture to things thrown together and do not have much coherence.

Answer 9: The point of the study is to compare patients with and without vitiligo. The methodology and introduction section have been rearranged. Please check again.

10. The article is poorly written. I would reject it.

Answer 10: Please re-evaluate the article. All of the sections you specified have been answered.