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Reviewer’s report:

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.

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.

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.

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 they were selected.

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

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).

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

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

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 of things thrown together and do not have much coherence.

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