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Reviewer's report:

The authors faced an interesting topic providing a comparison of methods to detect retinal lesions in patient undergoing LASIK surgery. After my evaluation I think there are needing some more modifications:

1) There is a bias in statistical evaluation: the authors included both eyes of same patient undergoing surgery. Like every other pair organ, both eyes of same person have an inner higher correlation, they can not be considered as single, independent ones. The authors should run again statistical evaluation using just one eye for patient or using compensatory statistical method usually adopted for pair organs.

2) The conclusion seem to state that both Goldmann examination and wide field SLO are needed in order to avoid to miss peripheral retinal lesions in these eyes. Your results show that SLO is not needed if a good Goldmann examination is performed. Lease rephrase the conclusion.

3) I deeply disagree with first sentence: myopia is not cancer or diabetes, simple myopia is not even a disease but a refractive defect, only a small percentage of myopic eyes evolve in pathologic myopia with could affect the style of life of people. Please, rephrase the first sentence.
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