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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 the second 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

Editor comments:

1- Table 4: p values for what?

Done

We correct the sequence of the table.

- P value of the T-test comparing Safety index of primary SMILE and Re- SMILE
- P value of the T-test comparing efficacy index of primary SMILE and Re- SMILE

2- Figure 2: panel D: what is the attempted SEQ in this graph? The target for primary SMILE only or the target for whole combined surgery?
3- Figure 4: At which time points were these Pentacam images taken? Please specify.

A: just before the primary SMILE

B: about one month after the primary SMILE procedure. As this was one of the planned two step surgeries, the surgeon decision, after counseling the patient, was not to wait for the remaining 2 weeks as the refraction was consistent with the predicted one, and stable since the first week postoperative.

C: first week after the Re-SMILE procedure

4- It is needed to provide more information regarding the figures in the figure legends. The figure and figure legends should be read full-in dependently.

Done

Figure 2 and 3: add:

A) Postoperative cumulative uncorrected distance Snellen visual acuity (UDVA) versus preoperative cumulative corrected distance Snellen visual acuity (CDVA)

B) Efficacy of the surgery by comparing postoperative UDVA to preoperative CDVA

C) Safety of the procedure by comparing pre- and postoperative CDVA

D) Accuracy of the surgery by comparing attempted versus achieved refractive spherical equivalent (SEQ) and presenting the regression formula describing the relation between them

E) Accuracy of the surgery by showing the deviation of achieved SEQ compared to attempted SEQ in steps

F) The residual refractive astigmatism
G) Accuracy of the surgery by comparing attempted versus achieved refractive cylinder and presenting the regression formula describing the relation between them.

Reviewer 1 comments:

1- The authors mentioned that "Assessment after the primary SMILE procedure was conducted at 1 day, 1 week, 1 month and 3 months postoperatively. Assessment after Re-SMILE was conducted at 1 day, 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and one year postoperatively. The assessments included objective and subjective refraction, and rotating Scheimpflug camera imaging." So Please provide the refractive and Scheimpflug camera imaging outcomes obtained before and at 1 day, 1 week, 1 month and 3 months after primary SMILE as well as before and at 1 day, 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and one year after Re-SMILE. When the outcomes were reported, it is indispensable to clarify that at which time point, those data were collected.

As a retrospective case series and not a prospective study, not all data were registered. The objective and subjective refraction were repeated following our usual schedule Every visit, the older data is replaced by the newer ones in the patients’ sheets. Only the just pre-SMILE and Pre-RE-SMILE as well as the final ones (1 year post-RE-SMILE) are kept, and at these visits the Pentacam images were taken. All the available data are presented. Accordingly, we didn’t add the stability of refraction graph.

Reviewer 2 comments:

1- The last figure should be corrected into "figure 4".

Done
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