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Author’s response to reviews:

Marco Lupidi, M.D.
Editor
BMC Ophthalmology

Dear Dr Lupidi,

We appreciate the comments of the reviewers on the manuscript BOPH-D-18-00698R1, entitled “The relationship between foveal outer nuclear layer thickness in the active and resolved phases of central serous chorioretinopathy treated with half-dose photodynamic therapy”.

We are pleased to submit herewith the revised manuscript, which addresses the points that have been raised by the reviewers. Each of the co-authors has seen and agreed to each of the changes made to this manuscript and the way his or her name is listed. We believe the reviewers’ recommendations have allowed us to improve the quality of our paper.

We address all the comments below.

Technical Comments:
Ilir Arapi, M.D. (Reviewer 2): All my points were sufficiently answered by the authors.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We believe that your recommendations have allowed us to improve the quality of our paper.

vikas ambiya, MS (Reviewer 3): I thank the editorial team for giving me the opportunity to review this article. The article has already been aptly amended according to the comments of previous reviewers. The article is acceptable in its present form after making a few minor corrections. These are as follows:

1. These points (line-70 & 71) in the inclusion criteria are irrelevant because they are actually points for exclusion and have rightfully been repeated as exclusion criteria in the text: "no staphyloma, choroidal excavation, or retinal dipping; RPE abnormality only at extra fovea". So I suggest that these lines should be deleted from the inclusion criteria as the alternate condition has already been mentioned as exclusion criteria. Otherwise it will be a repetition and will be irrelevant.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have deleted the following sentence in the inclusion criteria: “no staphyloma, choroidal excavation, or retinal dipping; RPE abnormality only at extra fovea”. [Methods: pg. 4, lines 70-71]

2. Lines 149-152 and lines 157-161 need a major correction in grammar and language. e.g. I suggest replacing the term "beneath RPE" with "underlying RPE”. There are a lot of grammatical mistakes in these lines which should be corrected.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have replaced the term “beneath RPE” with "underlying RPE". [Discussion: pg. 8, lines 147,150,152]. We are so sorry about the poor English in these lines. We have chosen Nature Research Editing Service to edit these sentences. These sentences were replaced with the following: “On an OCT image, the border of the subretinal space appears approximately as a triangle: the underlying RPE forms the base of the triangle, i.e., the bottom side, the outer border of the detached retina forms the other two sides, and the fovea is the top vertex of the triangle. Based on triangle inequality, the outer border of the detached retina is longer than the underlying RPE.” and “Furthermore, based on the above hypothesis, the morphological character of the subretinal space that the fovea always appears to
be the top vertex of the triangle can be explained as follows. The fovea, which consists mainly of photoreceptors, is the thinnest part of the retina with only one horizontal layer of ELM. In contrast, the parafoveal region consists of multiple layers, including the outer plexiform layer, inner plexiform layer, and retinal nerve fibre layer. This retinal architecture may make the foveal region mechanically weak; therefore, it will stretch more.” [Discussion: pg. 8, lines 149-152 and lines 157-161]

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

Response: Thank you for your advice. We have chosen Nature Research Editing Service to edit these sentences.

Editorial Policies

-------------------

Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements, this may cause a delay while this is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all manuscript submissions to BMC Ophthalmology must contain a Declarations section which includes the mandatory sub-sections listed below. Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines web page for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (https://bmcophthalmol.biomedcentral.com/).

Where a mandatory Declarations section is not relevant to your study design or article type, please write "Not applicable" in these sections.

For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found. We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files. Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared. Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons. For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).
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Response: Thank you. We included a Declarations section as required.