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Page 4; Line 77: please delete "by Al Hazmi and colleagues"

Page 5-6: The Speed of progression is completely arbitrary. How you choose to assess score 1 to 3 to IOP? Is it so relevant? The main outcome measures are the corneal diameter and the opacities. Can you show pictures of the corneas with the related score?

The "interval" is really relative. I think it is in "days" but it's not specified. You really describe the score and try to determine a speed of progression. The idea is good but but this is a relative concept. Tin congenital glaucoma the speed of progression might be simply the score divided for the age! Please improve and specify better your choices.

Figure 3 is not necessary and very similar to Fig.2.

Ref 6: please correct.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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