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Author's response to reviews: see over
We deeply appreciate the reviewers’ valuable comments.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) The authors need to check and update abbreviations across the text: as an example it is Ocular Response Analyzer (ORA) and not ORA (Ocular Response Analyzer), line 21. There are abbreviations, which have been defined more than once in the text. On occasions, the correct format has been used e.g. lines 26-27.

Answer: We updated the abbreviations as the reviewer’s recommendation.
These are applied at line 21, 29, 30, 112

2) The authors have correctly replaced the term “pentacam” with AST as they point out in their cover letter, but they need to ensure the changes are also reflected in the abstract. There are still parts e.g. abstract, line 26 which have not been updated.

Answer: We changed the “Pentacam” in the abstract to “an anterior segment tomographer”
These are applied at line 26,27

3) Line 122, “were collected consecutively”, replace “got consecutively”.

Answer: We change the sentence as the reviewer’s recommendation.
These are applied at line 121

4) Line 225, please replace “it may correspond to the fact” with “it may be due to the fact”.

Answer: We change the sentence as the reviewer’s recommendation.
These are applied at line 223
5) Lines 248-259: the authors provide a detailed account of their future research plans but what they really need to do for the purposes of the present discussion is to make a suggestion for a future study regardless of who is conducting the study, e.g. “a future study should investigate the association between….”. In my opinion, formulas and hypotheses for a future study should not be presented in this discussion.

**Answer:** We removed the formulas and hypotheses for a future study in the discussion. We made a suggestion for a future study the reviewer’s recommendation.

These are applied at line 246-247.

6) Lines 275-284: please summarize, do not repeat results, focus on the most significant findings.

**Answer:** We summarized the conclusions as the reviewer’s recommendation.

These are applied at line 261-266

**Discretionary Recommendations**

1) The aim of the study has been modified but there is still room for improvement. In my opinion, the authors should consider rephrasing to “…anterior segment parameters representing corneal geometric dimensions.” or “…anterior segment parameters representing geometric dimensions such as corneal volume and anterior chamber volume”.

**Answer:** We change the sentence as the reviewer’s recommendation.

These are applied at line 84-85

2) The authors have correctly discussed the possibility of sample size and ethnic variations in lines 213-216. Perhaps they could replace the actual numbers studied by others with a more general “smaller samples/groups patients”.
Answer: We change the sentence as the reviewer’s recommendation.

These are applied at line 213-214

3) Lines 267-274: Please rephrase e.g. “A limitation of the study is the inclusion of young only patients who are not representative of the normal Korean population and may have caused selection bias. However, in another large-scale study, of the determinants of corneal biomechanical properties in an adult Chinese population, CH was negatively associated….”

Answer: We change the sentences as the reviewer’s recommendation.

These are applied at line 255-258