Author's response to reviews

Title: Central corneal sensitivity after Small-incision lenticule extraction versus femtosecond laser-assisted LASIK for myopia: a meta-analysis of comparative studies

Authors:

Miao He (943602453@qq.com)
Wenyong Huang (andyhwyz@aliyun.com)
Xingwu Zhong (zhongxwu@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

Version: 2 Date: 16 September 2015

Author's response to reviews: see over
Cover letter

Dear editor

Thank you very much for your encouraging letter review and the reviewers for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions concerning our manuscript entitled “Small-incision lenticule extraction versus femtosecond laser-assisted LASIK for myopia: a meta-analysis of comparative studies” (MS: 3103889271669457). We have carefully read comments and suggestions and revised our manuscript accordingly. Our point-by-point responses to the comments and suggestions are listed below. We have sent our manuscript to a professional issue editing agency. The places that the reviewer pointed out were corrected in red font in the revised manuscript and information added also be marked in red.

We hope the revised version of the manuscript is acceptable for the publication in the journal.

Sincerely yours

Responses to the editors’ comments

Editor: We recommend that you copyedit the paper to improve the style of written English. If this is not possible, you may need to use a professional language editing service.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Accordingly, we have sent our manuscript to a professional issue editing agency to revise the manuscript. We believe that the manuscript has been significantly improved and hope it meets your requirement.

Responses to the reviewers’ comments

Reviewer Mahipal S Sachdev: The abstract states that central corneal sensitivity was higher after FS-LASIK (46-48), whereas the text states the opposite (196-198) i.e., central corneal sensitivity was higher after SMILE.
Response: Thank you very much for your careful review. We have corrected the error in line 48. The content in that place was corrected as “At 1 week, 1 month and 3 months after surgery, the central corneal sensitivity after FS-LASIK was lower than SMILE”.

Reviewer Mahipal S Sachdev: There are numerous spacing and grammatical errors.

Response: Thank you for carefully and patiently reviewing our manuscript, and listing so many mistakes in the original manuscript. We have sent our manuscript to a professional issue editing agency. We believe that the manuscript has been significantly improved and hope it meets your requirement.

Reviewer Mahipal S Sachdev: The title itself should be rephrased as it overestimates the scope of the study which is limited to central corneal sensitivity assessment and in no way is a real meta-analysis of two procedures across various parameters.

Response: We appreciate you for kindly raising this insightful question. The title of this manuscript has been changed as “Central corneal sensitivity after Small-incision lenticule extraction versus femtosecond laser-assisted LASIK for myopia: a meta-analysis of comparative studies”.

Reviewer Gregory J Stoddard: Please change all occurrences of "P = 0.000" to "P < 0.001", which will be consistent with the rest of your manuscript and be consistent with the American Medication Association (AMA) Manual of Style guideline for reporting p values.

Response: Thank you for carefully and patiently reviewing our manuscript, According to your advices, we have carefully modified these mistakes.

Reviewer Gregory J Stoddard: In the footnote to Table 1, please indicate if you are using mean+/-SD or mean+/-SEM (standard error of the mean).
**Response:** We thank you for kindly raising this insightful question. We have added one sentence in the end of the footnote of Table 1 “The results are performed as Mean ± SD”.

**Reviewer Guoying Mu:** This study is well designed and provides useful information for clinical practice. Although the results described in study should be interpreted with cautions due to the limited number of studies, this study meets the publication quality

**Response:** We are thankful for your patient review and encouragement.