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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This was a good study providing very informative data. But the organizing and writing of the manuscript was too casual and should be improved.

1. The method or assay for molecular analysis of IP10 should be specified. For example, was real time-PCR, ISH or SAGE used?

2. How was the sample sectioned into “fibrous tissue surrounding the Intacs” and “the central corneal stroma”?

3. Though it was stated that “the epithelial cells were flattened centrally and irregular or missing peripherally” in the text, the figures did not show such changes.
4. CD68+ cells are not only present in the inner aspect of Intacs, but also apical and lateral sides.
5. The reference to Fig2 should be placed accordingly in the text.
6. Minors: endothelial cells decreased in number, but the wording “attenuated” should be substituted; the blue arrows in Fig2 should be reverted;
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