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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. In the Methods: Was there consideration on Myopic/Hypermetropic Eye Prescription, as it has a role on the ocular dimensions? Please include inclusion/exclusion criteria on Prescription (e.g. +/− 3.00sph).

Minor Essential Revision
1. In the Introduction: Add a reference after the “Until very recently, most investigations evaluating corneal biomechanics were based on ex vivo tissue”.
2. In the Methods: there is mentioned IOP > 30mmHg: why did you choose this limit? Clinically IOP > 24 mmHg is considered high/suspicious. Please explain further.
3. In the Methods: How was the study sample size determined? Was there any power analysis performed? Please report if so.
4. In the Methods: when/ during what period did these patients visited the Eye Clinic?
5. In the Results: quite difficult to understand the figures and the statistics.
6. In the Discussion: Clinical Significance/use useful to discuss.
7. Please note:
   - In the last paragraph of the Discussion, start it with a conclusion line, e.g. To finally conclude from the above,…
   - Put full stops (.) or commas (,) after reference (e.g. “intraocular pressure measurements1, 2,” rather than “intraocular pressure measurements, 1, 2 ”).
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