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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we appreciate the editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Comparison of face-down posturing with nonsupine posturing after macular hole surgery: a meta-analysis.” (ID: BOPH-D-18-00022).

We have carefully gone through the reviewer’s comments and have made suitable revisions which are highlighted in red in the paper. We have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. Kindly go through the revised version, which we would like to submit for your kind consideration.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

You-xin Chen
Response to Reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Comparison of face-down posturing with nonsupine posturing after macular hole surgery: a meta-analysis.” (ID: BOPH-D-18-00022). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope will meet your requirements.

1. We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of EQW, as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to revising the manuscript, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

Answer: Thank you. EQW has been involved in revising our manuscript critically and statistical analysis. In Authors' contributions, “EQW contributed to the revision of the manuscript.” has been changed to “EQW contributed to the revision of the manuscript and statistical analysis”

2. As a member of the editorial board (Youxin Chen) of this journal, in order to ensure transparency, please declare this in the Competing Interests section of the Declarations.

Answer: We had added Competing interests “One of the authors, Youxin Chen, is a member of the editorial board of BMC ophthalmology. No other competing interests exist.”

3. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

E-mail: cyx4168@126.com
Department of Ophthalmology,
Peking Union Medical College Hospital,
Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences,
Beijing 100730, China


This overlap mainly exists in the Methods, Results and Discussion sections. While we understand that this is work that you have previously published, and some of the same ideas are contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. Please re-phrase and cite these sections accordingly to minimise overlap.

Answer: Thank you for your suggest. We had re-phased these sections.

Methods section, line 6-7, page 6, “The reference lists of the relevant articles were also manually examined to further identify potentially related studies. No language restriction was imposed” had been rewritten to “The references of the included studies were also screened to further identify related articles. No language limitation was imposed”.

Methods section, line 20-22, page 6 “After successive procedures of filtering titles and abstracts and obtaining and then reviewing the full text of each article, the literature that met the eligibility criteria and failed the exclusion criteria were included. Two authors (SX and XYZ) extracted and collated the relevant data independently” had been rewritten to “After filtering titles and abstracts, then reviewing the full texts of potentially related articles, the studies which fulfilled eligibility criteria and failed the exclusion criteria were included. SX and XYZ extracted and collated the relevant data”.

Methods section, line 3-8, page 7 “The corresponding authors of included studies would be contacted if requisite data were unavailable. The methodological quality of each included study was evaluated by 12-item scale [19]; a score of 7 or more was high quality, 4 to 7 was moderate quality, less than 4 was low quality. Kappa text was used to evaluate the disagreements and consensus was achieved by discussion with the corresponding author (YXC)” had been changed to “The corresponding authors of included studies would be contacted if requisite data were unavailable. The methodological quality of each included study was evaluated by 12-item scale [19]; a score of 7 or more was high quality, 4 to 7 was moderate quality, less than 4 was low quality. Kappa text was used to evaluate the disagreements and consensus was achieved by discussion with the corresponding author (YXC)”.
quality. Kappa text was used to evaluate the disagreements and consensus was achieved by discussion with the corresponding author (YXC)

Methods section, line 10-13, page 7 “StataSE 12.0 software (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) was used to perform the meta-analysis. In this meta-analysis, continuous data was described by the weighted mean difference (WMD) and its 95% confidence interval (CI), dichotomous data used odds risk (OR) and its 95% CI” had been changed to “StataSE 12.0 software (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) was used to perform the meta-analysis. In this meta-analysis, continuous data was described by the weighted mean difference (WMD) and its 95% confidence interval (CI), dichotomous data used odds risk (OR) and its 95% CI.”

Results section, line 3, page 8 “181 articles were initially identified for this meta-analysis.” had been rewritten to “181 articles were initially identified for this meta-analysis.”

Results section, line 10-12, page 8 “The results of 12-item scale showed that the average quality score of the included studies was 8.18 and all of them were of high quality (Table 2). The inter-rater agreement was excellent between the investigators (κ = 0.75)” had been changed to “The results of 12-item scale showed that the average quality score of the included studies was 8.18 and all of them were of high quality (Table 2). The inter-rater agreement was excellent between the investigators (κ = 0.75)”

Results section, line 11-12, page 11 “Begg’s test showed that publication bias did not affect our analysis (P=0.175, continuity corrected)” had been written to “Begg’s test showed that publication bias did not affect our analysis (P=0.175, continuity corrected).

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Answer: We had uploaded our final version.

Response to the reviewer’s SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

Yoshiaki Shimada (Reviewer 1): none

Answer: Thank you.
Makoto Inoue, MD, PhD (Reviewer 2): I do not believe that the authors understand the reviewer's comments. No point to point response included from the authors.

Answer: Thank you for your suggest.