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Analysis of retinopathy of prematurity screening in Tianjin, China

Reviewer 1
Well-conceived study need check for grammar.

To reviewer 1:
We have checked for grammar.

Reviewer 2:

1). They have not compared their data with other factors in other hospitals in China except the incidence of ROP, which has insufficient predictive values.
Response: We couldn’t do that yet and hope we can improve in the future.

2). The written English should be polished. There were many mistakes in the manuscript, including grammatical tense, singular and plural, etc. eg. in abstract, on P6 line 26,27 P7 line 11, P8 line 1, line 10,14,21,23. P9 line 33,38,41,44,46.
Response: We have checked and revised many mistakes.

3) The authors should revise the manuscript, particularly paying attention to the formatting of tables and their relevant legends and clarifying certain methodology details. Some data also appears to be presented twice, so I encourage the authors to pick only one method of presentation.
Response: We have revised these tables, deleted table1 and 2, and use one method of presentation.

4) There are too many tables and no graphs. I am sure some can transfer to figures to make the manuscript clearer.
Response: We have changed table5,7,8 to figure 1,2,3.

5) The table legends are not efficient. Table 1,3,4,5,6,7 have no explanations of the abbreviations.
Response: We have revised.

6) In the discussion, authors mentioned about inflammatory factors in ROP. Are there any relationship with the factors in this study?
Response: There aren’t any relationship with the factors in this study, so we have deleted this.

7) P5 line 29, the guidelines were published in 2004 which is contravisal with the reference “in 2005”.