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Reviewer's report:

The authors tried to compare the differences of SMILE and V4c. I read with interest about the outcomes reported. I recommend the authors to describe more on the method which is too rough, include all parameters which are potentially different and report accurate numbers.

1. Line 23: V4c has been launched for many years. Why did the authors use two recently in a sentence to emphasize an old product as new?

2. Is this study a prospective design or a retrospective design?

3. Which month/year did this study start and end?

4. How the subjects were selected for SMILE or V4c?

5. Cell count is a safety index for ICL, must be reported. Cell count should be different between groups, can be included for the comparison.

6. Contrast sensitivity and HOAs should be compared between groups as the authors mentioned their importance in the discussion.

7. Statistical analysis T test is not appropriate for including both eyes in the comparison.

8. Numbers were not matched between text and tables, very confused!!!!

9. Please correct the format of references

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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