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Author's response to reviews:

Concerning Manuscript BOPH-D-18-00858R2:

Dear Editor,

Once again, thank you for the valuable comments on our manuscript.

We have made a point-by-point list of all changes requested by the reviewers and hope that these improvements will make our paper suitable for publication in BMC Ophthalmology.

Yours sincerely,

Rasmus Christian Rasmussen, MD
Dept. of Ophthalmology
Odense University Hospital
Sdr. Boulevard 29
DK – 5000 Odense C, Denmark
Editor:

Editor: I suggest that you switch the concise summary that you have provided in the results section (lines 128-131) with the more informative synthesis at the beginning of the discussion (lines 195-214). The latter is a very nice synthesis of the results and conveys the essence of the results with enough detail to be useful to readers. The summary that is currently in the results section is better as an introduction to the discussion, where most of the text deals with the idea of validity. I believe this would really improve the paper.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have discussed it and agree that it improve the paper. It also addresses the issue we previously mentioned, that it was difficult to write a satisfying summary in the result section without repeating what was already in the discussion. Thus, we have made the switch you suggest (the switched paragraphs are highlighted in yellow).

Editor: Line105 - note that these were domains on the MERSQI instrument - you simply say 'domains' without noting the source.

Response: Thank you for noticing this. We have added clarification on line 105, stating the domains are from the MERSQI instrument.

Editor: Table 2 - no need to include MERSQI in the list of abbreviations.

Response: Thank you for noticing. Clearly something missed in the last revision. We have removed it.