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Dear Editor

Attached please find the revised manuscript entitled “Comparison of glaucoma diagnostic ability of ganglion cell-inner plexiform layer according to the range around the fovea”. A point-by-point response to each of reviewers’ comments follows. I really appreciate to your message about potential acceptance for publication.

Editor Comments:

Please improve the English by a native speaker and include all the suggestions by Reviewers.
Response: As your comments, the manuscript has been re-edited by the Nature Research Editing Service.

Reviewer reports:

Enrico Martini (Reviewer 1): I think the paper is now suitable for publication. I think some further effort should be done to ameliorate the english language.
I think that the sentence when you state that with declining GCIPL thickness the diagnostic ability increases should be reviewed to avoid confusion.
Therefore there are no substantial obstacles to publication.
Response: As your comments, the manuscript has been re-edited by the Nature Research Editing Service.

Arezoo Miraftabi (Reviewer 3): The data are interesting but the main limitation of study of use of central 24-2 instead of 10-2 as functional test. It must be mentioned as limitation in discussion.
Response: As your comments, we have mentioned these limitations as following sentences.
“Fourth, the participants in the present study underwent only standard 24-2 VF examination, not 10-2 VF test as functional test. Since the 10-2 visual field test has been useful tool to detect central visual
dysfunction, the further investigation will be needed to evaluate the relationship between the various GCIPL parameters according to the range around the fovea and the functional damage detected by the 10-2 VF test.”