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Reviewer's report:

Overall the manuscript titled 'Refractive corneal Inlay for presbyopia in emmetropic patients in Asia: 6-month clinical outcomes' was well written and the paper concluded that Flexivue microlens was safe and effective for improving near visual acuity.

Surgical techniques

The authors should mention detailed configuration of the pocket and the parameters of the laser (femto LDV Z4) used to create pocket and tunnel because the difference in configurations of pocket may affect the outcome of the surgery.

The tunnel width of 3.6 mm and length of 4.75 mm were stated but the parameters of lamellar incision (pocket diameter) is not mentioned in the paper. The best way is to draw a schematic diagram of pocket, tunnel and inlays in 2 views.

Material and methods

The parameters of Flexivue microlens should be mentioned in the paper such as diameter of the inlay, diameter of the central hole and thickness at different parts of the inlay.

Results

The sample sizes of 21 eyes is sufficient. Ophthalmic examination and complete range of tests and corneal scans were done to check the compatibility, tissue responses and visual acuity and aberrations.

Discussion

The paper stated that there is no significant changes in central corneal thickness. Since Flexivue microlens has central hole, the CCT (central cornea thickness) is not expected to change significantly but how about peripheral corneal thickness? The quantitative assessment of peripheral corneal thickness will help detect changes in corneal structure.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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