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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Amy Branch-Hollis,

Thank you so much for your consideration.

I have finished writing an author response letter and revising the manuscript in response to your comments.

Today, I will submit the manuscript to BMC Ophthalmology.

Again, I greatly appreciate your decision on our study report.

Best regards,

Hirotaka
Authors' Responses:

Comments to the Author

1. Please clarify whether the patent for the "Eye brush" has been approved or not in the Competing interests section of your manuscript.

Our response to this comment

We have changed the sentences in the Competing interests section of our manuscript to “The authors have no financial or non-financial competing interests for this study. A patent application for the Eye Brush (Application number 2016-024394, Japan) may be applicable in the future (Dr. Kazuo Tsubota, Dr. Hirotaka Tanabe), but it is still in progress as of January 22, 2019.”

2. Please clearly state whether the authors have any financial or non-financial competing interests in the Competing interests section of your manuscript.

Our response to this comment

We have changed the sentences in the Competing interests section of our manuscript to “The authors have no financial or non-financial competing interests for this study. A patent application for the Eye Brush (Application number 2016-024394, Japan) may be applicable in the future (Dr. Kazuo Tsubota, Dr. Hirotaka Tanabe), but it is still in progress as of January 22, 2019.”
3. Please remove the editorial certificate and the response to reviewers letter as these are no longer needed at this time.

Our response to this comment

We have removed the editorial certificate and the response to reviewers letter.

4. The link provided in the Trial registration appears to require a log-in to access the page. Please only include the link to the publicly available page in this section.

Our response to this comment

We have changed the link provided in the Trial registration to “https://upload.umin.ac.jp/cgi-open-bin/ctr_e/ctr_view.cgi?recptno=R000019504.”

5. Please indicate what date your study was registered at UMIN in the trial registration section of your Abstract. Please also state whether this study was retrospectively registered.

Our response to this comment

We have added “Registration date: March 24, 2015; the study was prospectively registered.” in the trial registration section of our Abstract.

6. Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section of your manuscript. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.

Our response to this comment

We have added “Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.” in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section of our manuscript.
7. We note that two authors have the same initials (MK). To distinguish between them in the Authors’ Contributions section please designate them as MK1 and MK2, with MK1 corresponding to Motoko Kawashima, chosen because this name is furthest up the author list.

Our response to this comment

We have changed the two MKs to MK1 and MK2 in the Authors’ Contributions section.

8. Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

Currently, the contributions of author Kazuo Tsubota do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. Authors are expected to fulfil the criteria below (adapted from McNutt et al., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Feb 2018, 201715374; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1715374115; licensed under CC BY 4.0):

Each author is expected to have made substantial contributions to the conception OR design of the work; OR the acquisition, analysis, OR interpretation of data; OR the creation of new software used in the work; OR have drafted the work or substantively revised it

AND to have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author's contribution to the study);

AND to have agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.

Acquisition of funding, collection of data or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

If these guidelines are not met, we would request the following change of authorship form be filled out and sent to our editorial office
Our response to this comment

We have changed the sentences in the Authors' contributions section of our manuscript to “HT designed the study, analyzed and interpreted the data, performed the examination, and played a major role in writing the manuscript. KT made substantial contributions to the conception of the study. All other authors (MK1, MK2, RI, and TK) contributed to data interpretation and critically reviewed the manuscript. All authors have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author's contribution to the study) and have agreed to be held personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.”

9. We note that additional file 6 has not been cited in the manuscript. Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

Our response to this comment

We have confirmed that additional file 6 has been cited in the Evaluation of efficacy section in the Results of our manuscript.

10. 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.

Our response to this comment

We have uploaded our manuscript as a single, final clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. We have confirmed that all relevant tables/figures/additional files are also clean versions and Figures (and additional files) remain uploaded as separate files.
Again, thank you very much for your consideration.

I greatly appreciate your decision on our study report.

Best regards,

Hirotaka