

Responses to the reviewers' comments

Manuscript ID: 54719

Title: Altered regional homogeneity in patients with diabetic vitreous hemorrhage: a resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging study

Dear Dr. Na Ma,

Thank you very much for your letter inviting us to submit a revised version of the above-mentioned manuscript. We have revised the paper according to the Editor's and Reviewer's suggestions. Attached please find the revised version of the paper, with highlighting where changes have been made in the revised manuscript.

Below are our specific responses to the reviewers' comments.

Reviewer #1:

Q1- English languish should be carefully re-reviewed I will give only examples page 4line 9 Hypertension instead of hypertensive. Page 4 Line 10 dyslipidemia instead of elevated cholesterol levels

RE: Thanks for your advice. We have re-reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Q2- Question 1- Does patients who had retinal vein occlusion are diabetics?

RE: Yes, the patients who had retinal vein occlusion are diabetics.

Q3- Question 2- Diabetic patients in both groups were type 1 or T2DM? what was the duration of DM? what was their level of Diabetes control?

RE: The diabetic patients in both groups were T1DM or T2DM. The duration of DM was the time from the first discovery of diabetes to the time of joining our research and their diabetes is under good control.

Q4- Question 3- Are there any specific differences between ReHo between those who DVH and those who have VH due to retinal vein occlusion

RE: We have compared the differences of ReHo between those who had VH caused by retinopathy (DR) and those who have VH due to retinal vein occlusion, and there were no specific differences. So, we gather the data together and compare the differences

between DVH patients and healthy control.

Editorial Office's comments

Q1 Format: 3 tables and 7 figures. 37 references were cited. No self-citation.

RE: We have revised the format of the tables and figures.

Q2 Language evaluation: Grade C. Language editing certificate was not properly provided. The document is blank and could not be checked.

RE: We have revised the manuscript and upload the language editing certificate.

Q3 Academic norms and rules: The Institutional Review Board Approval Form was not properly provided. The conflict-of-interest disclosure form was not provided properly, which only need to be provided by corresponding author. Biostatistics Review Certificate and Clinical Trial Registration Statement were provided. The CONSORT 2010 Statement was uploaded. The copyright license agreement was uploaded. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. The highest single-source similarity index is 16%, the repetitive parts should be rephrased.

RE: Thanks, we have re-uploaded these files.

Q4 Supplementary comments: (1) Unsolicited manuscript. (2) Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant nos. 81660158 and 81400372) and other three funds of Jiangxi province. (3) Corresponding author has not published articles in WJD.

RE: Done, thanks.

Q5 Issues raised: (1) Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text; (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; (3) The title should be no more than 12 words. (4) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

RE: We have added the section of "article highlights" and revised the format of reference and title. Also, the original pictures were uploaded.

(2) *Editorial Office Director*: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

RE: Thanks.

(3) *Company Editor-in-Chief*: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report and the full text of the manuscript, of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revision. Before final acceptance, the author need to meet ethics requirement by submitting correct documents. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please send the revised manuscript to the same reviewer for a second round of peer review.

RE: Done, thanks.

Best regards,

Yi Shao

Responses to the reviewers' comments

Manuscript ID: 54719

Title: Altered regional homogeneity in patients with diabetic vitreous hemorrhage: a resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging study

Dear Editor and reviewer,

Thank you very much for your letter inviting us to submit a revised version of the above-mentioned manuscript. We have revised the paper according to the reviewers' second round comments/suggestions and provide point-by-point. Attached please find the revised version of the paper, with highlighting where changes have been made in the revised manuscript.

Below are our specific responses to the reviewers' comments.

Reviewer #1:

Q3- I asked about the duration of diabetes of the patients. His answer it is from the date of first discovery to the date joining the research. This answer is the definition of the duration in those patients but does not answer the question. The answer should hong long the patients has been diabetics before DVH? 10 years or 50 years for example and it has to be included in a table with demographic data. Also the question about the degree of patients control: answered: thein diabetes is under good control. Again we need an hgbA1c level in the demographic data table too.

RE: Thanks. The duration of DM and the HgbA1c level were added in the Table 1.

Best regards,

Yi Shao