Reviewer’s report

Title: Cap-Preserving SMILE Enhancement Surgery

Version: 0 Date: 15 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Yang Shen

Reviewer's report:

The authors investigated the efficacy of Re-SMILE for reducing residual refractive errors after primary SMILE procedure. This study is interesting and meaningful. However, before it can be considered for publication, major revisions are indispensable.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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