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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Size of frame/picture analyzed in each instrument? Same in two instruments? If not, is this taken into consideration in the analysis? Please include details.

2. Patient demographics are useful. Also, further additionally inclusion and exlusion criteria – which corneal diseases were included, when did the keratoplasty patients have the operation performed etc.

3. Useful to show results of each corneal disease group separately.

4. Numerous studies have shown endothelial cell loss and increase in polymegathism and pleomorphism with age in both normal and keratoplasty patients:


   • etc. etc.

Please analyze your results in age groups as well.

Minor Essential Revision
2. Line 20-22: Rephrase, avoiding the one of two “thus”.
3. Line 41: Rephrase: ” also only”.
4. Lines 62-63: Rephrase: “However, over time the microscopes used in one clinic might be exchanged.”
Line 99: Rephrase. Better – a comparison of…was performed.
5. Lines 174-176: Put the reference after “De Sanctis et al compared the same Topcon instrument SP2000P with the Konan CC7000 non-contact specular microscope”.

**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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