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Reviewer's report:

The authors investigate the effect of donor quality on the outcomes and complications after DALK. The similar study was previously conducted by Feizi et al. who recruited a homogeneous group of keratoconus-affected patients and a larger sample size. The results of the study are very similar to Feizi et al's study except the authors did not find a significant correlation between donor features and epithelium-related problems postoperatively. However, Feizi et al. reported a significant association between donor quality and postoperative epithelial defects. The followings can be considered to strengthen the study:

1- The authors did not provide donor grading. How many donors were of very good, good, or poor quality? Did the graft quality have any effect on the outcomes and complications.

2- The authors did not provide information on epithelium status and graft stromal edema at the time of transplantation.

3- The authors recruited a heterogeneous of patients with a wide range of preoperative diagnosis. This diversity could affect the results of the study. Please, discuss this point.

4- Page 8, lines 36-39 "thereof 9 donor buttons were cold storaged (13%) and 53 were organ cultured (87%)" should be wrong. 9+53=62 not 67
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