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Reviewer's report:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Statistical analyses, the author did not describe the normality test of the data, please supply it.
2. The description of “spherical myopia of up to #12.0 D, myopic astigmatism up to #4.0 D cyl” is not formal, it would be better to say spherical myopia less than #12.0 D and myopic astigmatism less than #4.0 D cyl.

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. It would be better if the article can be carefully edited for proper English usage.
2. Abstract, the last sentence, the high-myopia and the mild- to moderate-myopia should be the high-myopic and mild- to moderate-myopic.
3. Background, the first sentence, refractory surgery is not the corrected description, please correct it.
4. Background, the third paragraph, there are several format errors, please correct.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Results, Study population, the central cornea thickness is not comparable between the two groups, and the preoperative CDVA is also not comparable, which might have an effect on the long time outcomes after surgery, the results might be not authentic.
2. Background, the second paragraph, the last sentence, theoretically speaking, SMILE cut more tissue for the creation of the basement and for patients with both spherical and cylindrical errors, it may not suitable to say that SMILE is more suitable when the degree of myopic correction is too large or the cornea is too thin for safe LASIK or PRK.
3. Table 1, the UDVA and CDVA is reversed, please correct it.
4. Results, figure 1,2,4,5 are the repeat of the data in the content, which would make those figures seemed to be not essential.
5. In the Efficacy part of the Results, the author said that “No significant
differences were observed between groups A and B for both postoperative uncorrected visual acuity and corrected visual acuity”, however, in the second paragraph, the author said “Group A had a better UDVA at 12 months, compared with Group B; although, no significant difference in the UDVA was evident until the 6-month follow-up”, which was inconsistent.

6. Discussion, the fourth paragraph, the visual recovery time of the SMILE surgery and LASIK surgery were not compared in this study, it is not convincing to draw the conclusion that the early visual recovery is not influenced by the degree of myopic correction just according to the UDVA after SMILE surgery.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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