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Author’s response to reviews:

March 14, 2019

Andreas Ebneter, M.D., Ph.D.
BMC Ophthalmology

Dear Dr. Ebneter:

I wish to again re-submit the manuscript titled “Incidence of Retinopathy of Prematurity Type 1 and Type 2 in a Regional Hospital of the Social Security in the State of Querétaro, Mexico (2017-2018)”. The manuscript ID is BOPH-D-18-00981R1.

We thank you for your thoughtful suggestions and insights and appreciate this opportunity to improve the language within the manuscript. The manuscript has benefited from these insightful suggestions. I look forward to working with you and the reviewers to move this manuscript closer to publication in the BMC Ophthalmology.

The manuscript has been rechecked and the necessary changes have been made in accordance with your suggestions. The point-by-point responses to all comments have been prepared and provided below.

Sincerely,

Roger Acevedo-Castellón
Response to Comments from Editor to the Authors

Thank you for submitting a revised version of your manuscript. Despite the certificate from the editorial service, the job done by them is poor, and I am sorry to inform you that the current version of the manuscript is not suitable for publication in English. Once again, significant editing of the manuscript to improve grammar and style is needed, otherwise it is not comprehensible for readers. Attached is an annotated version of your pdf with some suggestions for change, however, I may not have identified all the mistakes since there is many.

Thank you very much for your kind observations. We have considered them all and made changes in the manuscript accordingly. We have also contacted EDITAGE support team to request a significant editing of the manuscript to improve grammar and style based on your appreciation.

Aside from language issues, I found other problems that need to be fixed:

- the statistical analysis is wrong. Paired analysis (for serial data or otherwise not independent measurements) cannot be used in this scenario, since the samples are independent (different children). Also, have you really used ANOVA? One-way, two-way? I have only found some statistical test results for table 1.

Thank you very much for your observation. We have changed the manuscript to describe correctly the statistical analysis realized. We used ANOVA one-way, to compare mean Birth Weight, mean Gestational Age, and mean Post Menstrual Age between two groups, as suggested by one of the reviewers (Dr. Claire Gilbert), those who required treatment (Advanced ROP and ROP type I), and those who did not required treatment (Mature Retina, Immature Retina, Mild ROP and ROP Type II).

We have attached a Microsoft Excel file that contains data used for the analysis, and they can be used to corroborate our statistics.

- the term 'sub-threshold' is not used in literature in the context of ROP. It must be changed to 'pre-threshold' instead

Thank you very much for your observation. We have corrected the manuscript.