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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?: Yes

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?: No

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?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

**Comments to authors:**

The authors have reported the immunopathologic features of Intacs corneal rings for the first time. Their findings are of interest. However, a few areas need some clarification:

1. On pathologic examination what did the crystalline deposits represent?
2. The details for measuring the mRNA levels of the two chemokines should either be included or referenced to a previous publication. Was this done by laser capture microdissection?
3. The authors may want to comment on the severe endothelial attenuation and whether it is consistent with advanced keratoconus or if they think it could be
related to the Intacs.
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