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Author’s response to reviews:

Nov 16, 2017

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice on our manuscript. We have resubmitted new version of manuscript in accordance with the style of BMC Endocrine Disorders. Our manuscript has been reviewed by professional English language editing service. We have addressed the comments raised by reviewers, and the amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. We hope that the revision is acceptable and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Our specific comments to reviewers are as follows:
Yasir Elhassan (Reviewer 1)

1. The authors defined treatment response as the manifestation of 3 or more of the outcomes listed in table 1 but without any referencing to the basis of this.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. In revised manuscript we added Kahaly 2005 (reference 5) and Zhu 2014 (reference 7) as the bases of “overall response”. Both these two studies were high quality studies. They also been cited in EUGOGO 2016. In Kahaly 2005, they defined the response to glucocorticoids therapy as an improvement of at least three clinical objective parameters. They also quoted another three studies to support their point. In Zhu 2014, they clearly presented a definition of “overall response” to evaluate the response to ivGC therapy, which was exactly the same as our study. (Line 1, page 5)

Kahaly 2005: Randomized, single blind trial of intravenous versus oral steroid monotherapy in Graves’ orbitopathy. J Clin Endocrinol Metab.


2. Legends need to be added to table 2 otherwise you cannot tell what is between the brackets.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We fully agree with the suggestion. Continuous variables were reported as the median±SD or median [interquartile intervals, 25th–75th percentile], and categorical variables were reported as percentages. We added legends to explain the numbers in table 2. (Line 8, page 9)

3. The manuscript must undergo extensive review by a native English speaker before it is suitable for publication.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. Our manuscript has been reviewed by professional English language editing service (International Science Editing).

Christine May (Reviewer 2)

1. The article would benefit from improvement in its English grammar and language.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. Our manuscript has been reviewed by professional English language editing service (International Science Editing).

2. The retrospective nature of the study does not appear in the title or abstract. Personally I think this should be clearly stated in the abstract and title.
Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion. The title has been revised as “A Single-Center Retrospective Study of Factors Related to the Effects of Intravenous Glucocorticoid Therapy in Thyroid-associated Ophthalmopathy.” (Line 1, page 1)

3. It would be useful to know more about how you identified your study population, including more details on how you identified the patient.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion and added a table (Table 1) to explain detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria. (Line 18, page 5)

4. The percentage of your sample made up from this group should be defined in the initial data.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion. (Line 2, page 8)

5. Your p-value for the duration of eye symptoms was within 3 months is different from that in the text.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We are sorry that it is a mistake because our carelessness. We corrected the p-value to 0.000. (Line 12, page 2)

6. The word "useless" is an odd word no doctor would advise a useless treatment; do you mean non-effective or ineffective therapy?

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion. It should be ineffective therapy. (Line 7, page 4)

7. Grammar point- This is a "retrospective" study not "retrospectively"

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion. (Line 15, page 4 and line 14, page 15)

8. A short statement of the race if possible would therefore be useful to have in patient demographics to strengthen your discussion later.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. All patients were Asians. (Line 1, page 8)

9. What do you mean by "present"?
Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion to delete the “present”. The mistake was due to language problem. (Line 1, page 8)

10. Why repeat "the response rate was 57.8%"? Is this not what you mean by responsive group in the lines above?

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We followed the suggestion to delete this sentence. (Line 6, page 8)

11. Do you really mean a p-value =0.000, this is different to your abstract p-value for this statement. Which is correct?

Response: P-value is =0.000. We have corrected the p-value in abstract.

12. In the UK typically a person who has never smoked throughout their life is termed a "non-smoker", is this what you mean by never?

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We explained these definitions in our manuscript. (Line 16, page 13)

13. You mention short follow up time, was there only 4 week follow up CAS? If not what was your follow up time? I would advise it is include in study methods.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We observed patients from the beginning of the ivGCs therapy to the fourth week after icGCs therapy. The mean follow-up time was four weeks. We added it in our manuscript. (Line 5, page 6)

14. You never discuss side effects of treatment in your paper but your last sentence talks about liver damage, it is not relevant to your study aim or discussed earlier in your paper. I do not feel this is appropriate sentence to end on.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We fully agree with the suggestion and have deleted the sentences about side effects. (Line 20, page 14)

15. Correct abbreviations ivGC has corrected to IvGC.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We are sorry that it is a mistake because our carelessness. We corrected the abbreviation to ivGC. (Line 4, page 15)

Thank you again for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.
Sincerely,

Xianqun Fan, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of Ophthalmology
Ninth People’s Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine
No. 639 ZhiZaoJu Road, Shanghai, 200011, P. R. China
Tel: +86 021 6313 5606
Fax: +86 021 6313 7148
Email: fanxq@sjtu.edu.cn