Author’s response to reviews

Title: Comparison of the effects of photodynamic therapy, intravitreal ranibizumab and combination for polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy under 1+PRN regimen

Authors:

Kunbei Lai (103102197@qq.com)
Ying Li (zocliying@sina.com)
Lijun Zhou (qimingxing1256@gmail.com)
Xiaojin Zhong (drxiaojinzong@sina.com)
Chuangxin Huang (sumshuang@163.com)
Fabao Xu (xufabaobao@sina.com)
Lin Lu (drlulin@126.com)
Jian Ge (gejian@mail.sysu.edu.cn)
Chenjin Jin (jinchj@mail.sysu.edu.cn; laibaby@163.com)

Version: 2 Date: 06 May 2018

Author’s response to reviews:

Point by point responses to the editor's and the reviewer's comments:

Dear Editor and Reviewer,

Thanks so much for the useful comments again! We have carefully revised our manuscript according to the editor's and the reviewer’s suggestions. All the modifications are listed as follows:
Editor Comments:

Although you claimed several times in the main text that this is a retrospective study, however, we suspected that this is a prospective study from details of your methods.

1. You claimed that "Written informed consent was obtained after all the subjects received detailed explanations for the study protocol." and "The study was conducted after obtaining the written informed consent from the patients."

2. Patients received different treatment regimens in the period 2012/10 - 2015/07.

If you would like to confirm us that this is a retrospective study, you need to explain well to the fact why two different treatment regimens are used for patients in this time period, and how you obtain the written informed consent, and exactly what is that consent for. Otherwise, you need to re-write your article as a prospective one, and also send us the ethics approval document for check.

Re: The editor was quite right that our study was a prospective study in the first place. This study was one part of a multicenter, prospective study named "A multicenter, prospective, observational registry study of different treatments for neovascular age-related macular degeneration ". "1+PRN" treatment regimen is a clinical routine treatment method for neovascular age-related macular degeneration (including polypoidal choroidal vasculopathy), which is approved by China Food and Drug Administration. And this study was also approved by the Institutional Review Board of Zhongshan Ophthalmic Center, Sun Yat-sen University. We sent the ethics approval document of this study in the submit system for checking.

We would like to explain why we wrote this paper in a retrospective way in the first time we submitted this manuscript: the content of manuscript was one part of the multicenter, prospective study, because we collected and analyzed the patient data just from our hospital (one center of the multicenter). And because when we prepared the manuscript, this multicenter, prospective study has already been finished, therefore, we wrote this manuscript in a retrospective way (from one center of the multicenter) at first time when we submitted this manuscript.

However, as the editor said, our study should be a prospective study, we re-wrote our article as a prospective one in the revised manuscript, and we also sent the ethics approval document for you to check on the on-line submit system.

Thanks for the suggestions again!
Reviewer reports:

Christina J. Flaxel (Reviewer 2): The authors have written an interesting paper. I have some minor suggestions for revision. Background page - keep the first sentence of paragraph 2 then delete lines 41-rest of that page and delete lines 1-45 on the next page - end your background with the final sentence as to why this study is being done. The deleted items are discussed in the discussion and do not need to be addressed twice. The remainder of the paper is fine - it would be nice to shorten the discussion a bit but I could find no good way to do this and maintain the content in the discussion.

Re: Thanks so much for the useful suggestions! According to the suggestion of Christina, we kept the first sentence of paragraph 2 and deleted lines 41-rest of that page as well as lines 1-45 on the next page in the Background part to avoid being discussed twice in the manuscript.

At last, we hope that our manuscript could be published in BMC OPHTHALMOLOGY, which might provide some important and useful information for the ophthalmologists all around the world to help them to make a better treatment regime for patients with macula-involved PCV through the journal of BMC OPHTHALMOLOGY.

Thanks so much again for the useful comments from the editors and the reviewers!

Best Regards,

Chenjin Jin