

Reviewer #1:

This paper aimed to study the change regularity between age and SFCT in proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR). The results of the study reveal a negative association between age and SFCT in PDR patients, with this relationship persisting even after adjustment for potential confounding factors. The use of both univariate and fully adjusted models strengthens the reliability of the findings. Furthermore, the identification of a nonlinear correlation between age and SFCT, with an inflection point at 54 years, adds depth to the understanding of this relationship. This study represents a significant improvement in researching the nonlinearity of addressing compared to previous studies, ensured the reliability of the results by conducting a stratified analysis to test the robustness of the findings. Overall this is an interesting paper and the results presented are novel and important. I have only one concern about this article. The conclusion of this study in the abstract “The study showed that age was negatively associated with the average SFCT of PDR patients” is not accurate enough. In Figure 1, we can see that the age and SFCT of PDR patients are not negatively correlated before the age of 54. Please modify this conclusion.

Response: Thank you for the reviewer’s kind suggestion. We have already made corrections to the original text.

Reviewer #2:

The study investigating the relationship between subfoveal choroidal thickness (SFCT) and age in Chinese patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR) fills a notable gap in the existing literature, as there is limited research on this specific topic. By examining SFCT in relation to age among individuals with PDR, the study sheds light on potential factors influencing choroidal thickness in this patient population. The results of the study reveal a negative association between age and SFCT in PDR patients, with this relationship persisting even after adjustment for potential confounding factors. The use of both univariate and fully adjusted models strengthens the reliability of the

findings. Furthermore, the identification of a nonlinear correlation between age and SFCT, with an inflection point at 54 years, adds depth to the understanding of this relationship. However, there are several places need to be improved.

1) Please notice that abbreviations must have a full name explanation when they first appear. In the first sentence of abstract, SFCT appeared in abbreviated form, the full name only appeared in the second sentence.

Response: Thank you for the reviewer's careful review. We are extremely grateful to the reviewer for pointing out this problem. We have revised this sentence and other similar errors.

2) In the method section, please briefly describe a priori power calculations utilized in the determination of group sizes. If these were not used, please explain how group sizes were decided upon. In the discussion section, the author mentioned that "the sample size of this study was relatively small", so what is the appropriate sample size?

Response: We are grateful for the reviewer's precious comment and suggestion. Because our study is retrospective, the number of participants who meet the inclusion and exclusion criteria has already been determined once the time has been determined. We checked the whole text carefully and could not find this sentence "the sample size of this study was relatively small", we believe that our sample size is sufficient to support the conclusion of this manuscript.

3) Please provide specific statistical methods for comparing each group of data in the explanatory section of Table 2 and Table 5.

Response: We are extremely grateful to the reviewer for pointing out this problem. Table 2 is "Univariate linear regression analysis of SFCT measurements by EDI-OCT", the statistical method is clearly stated in this title, and we think there is no need to explain it in the explanatory section. According to the reviewer's advice, we have already added statistical methods "The adjustment strategy for each stratification was identical to that of Model III except for the stratification factor." in the explanatory section of Table 5. And thanks again.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly and hope that the correction will meet with approval.