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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

I am so grateful to your comments for the manuscript and studied the valuable comments from you and appreciated the valuable advice and suggestion from the reviewers. According to your advice, we have tried our best to carefully revise our manuscript. The point to point responds to reviewer’s comments are listed as following and we have highlighted all changes made when revising the manuscript.

Response to Reviewers’ comments:

Reviewer #1:

Comment1: The results are clear and the discussion is a bit old fashion and seems to miss all what has been done since Prospect and RethinQ. New indices, recent paper: Risum, Galli, Russel, Lumens…manuscript should be discussed more.
Response: Thank you for pointing out the problems of results and good suggestions, we have added the relevant articles from Risum, Galli, Russel, Lumens et al in discussion (page 20-21, line 334-337) and discuss those results with our study from different points of view (page 22-23, line 363-89; page 24, line 425-432).

Comment 2: The abstract: the endpoint should be written.

Response: Thank you for your carefully work, and we add the primary and secondary endpoint in abstract (page 3, line 13-15) and in method (page 8, line 105-106).

Comment 3: Perhaps should it be added somewhere that it is a prospective pilot study.

Response: thank you for your carefully reading our manuscript, and we are grateful to your valuable time and work. We add the sentence of a prospective pilot study in abstract (page 3, line 10) and method (page 7, line 93).

Reviewer #2:

Comment 1: It may be to rewrite the results in a way that makes them easier to read and understand, and not to report all numbers in the text but only in the figures or into the tables.

Response: Thank you for carefully reading and good advice, we have delete all the numbers in the text of result and draw a new table (table 2) to list all the STE parameters in control, responder, Non-responder group respectively to make results more easier to read.

Comment 2: We can suggest to the same order for all the parameters analyzed in the results section: controls, non-responders and responders.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion, based on comment 1, we have deleted the numbers in the text of results, and didn’t list all the comparison results between all groups in the text and presented the comparison results in table 2 and list the numbers in the order of controls, non-responders and responders.

Comment 3: The authors should add the variability for all STE parameters studied.
Response: Thank you for your valuable and thoughtful advice, we have studied all STE parameters once again including EC,ECT,ECR ECTR,MLS,TTO and TTP of thirty randomly selected examinations (20 pre-implant patients and 10 controls) and re-evaluated by the original observer and a second, independent observer. The intra-observer and inter-observer reproducibility was evaluated by Bland-Altman method comparison and intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC), and the results of variability was listed in table 5 and figure 5 was redrew to show the blant-altman curve of each STE parameters.

Comment 4: The authors should report the average time is needed to calculate all these parameters.

Response: Thank you for your comments and we recorded the time consumption in calculating all STE parameters in random 25 patients of our cohort, and describe the average time in separated paragraph in the result (page19,line315-318).

Comment 5: Do the authors use a single measurement or the average of multiple measurements for each STE parameters?

Response: Thank you for your question and we are appreciated for your valuable time in reading this manuscript. It’s our mistake not to mention it clearly in the manuscript. We have added the sentence ‘The average of three measurements of each STE parameters were used for further analysis and the average time needed to calculate STE parameters were also recorded’ in method(page9,line127-129).