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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor in Chief of BMC Ophthalmology Journal:

We are pleased that the editors’ opinion was to consider our manuscript after major revision, and we hope we could give reasonable answers to reviewers’ inquiries.

Here under is a point-by-point reply to reviewers’ comments:

All changes highlighted by red color in the manuscript

Reviewer 1 comments:

1- As a retrospective case series, the sample size of this study is so small that it is not applicable to divide these participants into two groups. Moreover, because of low sample size of studies have low statistical power, the bias control is very important. The author should clarify how to control the bias.

Reply:

We delete subgrouping of patients from the text and from the tables and by deleting the groups; there is no more bias
2- In my opinion, a prospective design should be more appropriate for assessing the efficacy of a surgery. In addition, as the risk of a secondary operation is greater than the primary one, the safety of Re-SMILE should be evaluated as well.

Reply:

The safety of Re-SMILE already evaluated.

a- We added the safety index of primary SMILE for Re-SMILE in abstract line 36

b- It is already mentioned in results section line 200

c- It is already mentioned in table 4

3- I hope the authors can report the tomographic parameters including the values of keratometry, thinnest corneal thickness and residual stromal bed thickness. These parameters are essential for preoperative assessment as well as postoperative follow-ups. Furthermore, for any clinical studies of a refractive surgery, standardized graphs and terms should be included when the results are reported[1-5]. I recommend that the authors should provide the pre-operative and post-operative tomographic parameters and the standardized six graphs as they are very important for assessing the efficacy and the safety of Re-SMILE procedure.

Reply: Done

a- The keratometry and corneal thickness represented in results (table 5)

b- The surgical parameters including the residual stromal bed thickness represented in patients and methods (table 1 and 2) and paragraph line 95 for primary SMILE and line 117 for Re-SMILE.

c- We removed table 3 and replace it with the standardized graphs for both SMILE and Re-SMILE procedures in results section (graph1 and 2)

4- More classical references should be added in this article, for example, the first article that reported the efficacy of SMILE procedure [6] should be added in Line 49

Reply:

Done
We added two other references line 49 and adjust the number of references accordingly

5- In Line 53, "7.19±1.30D" should be corrected into "-7.19±1.30D"

Reply:

Done

Reviewer 2 comments:

1- Line 35-36 : Modify "After Re-SMILE it was: -0.21 ± 0.4 ” by “After Re-SMILE it was: -0.21 ± 0.40”.

Reply:

Done

2- Line 21: “Background “ should be “ BACKGROUND

Reply:

Done

3- There are only 9 eyes received the Re-smile surgery. If the author provides the surgery parameters of primary surgery and re-SMILE surgery of every patient, it will help readers to have a better understanding of the design of Re-smile surgery.

Reply:

Done

The surgical parameters of primary surgery and re-SMILE surgery of every patient presented in patients and method section (table 1 and 2)

4- Re-smile surgery is a new method of SMILE enhancement surgery. There may be some complications during the surgery. We know that there exists the cavity between the cap and
stroma, how to avoid the influence of the cavity during the design of the surgery? In discussion section, the author could give more discussion on the probable complications of re-smile surgery and provide some good methods to avoid the complications

Reply:

a - As regard the cavity we add a paragraph in discussion section line 269

b - As regard other difficulties or complications, we add a paragraph in discussion section line 263

5 - Page 9, table 1 and page 10 table 2. Please add “P-value” in the table.

Reply:

Done

6 - In table 1, I suggest the format of “Mean ± SD” like in table 2.

Reply:

Done

7 - Please recheck the format of references.

Reply:

Done