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Reviewer’s report:

This study evaluated the ocular surface characteristics and Demodex Infestation in Paediatric and Adult Blepharokeratoconjunctivitis (BKC). However, some points are not clear in the design of the study. The actual study seemed like an accumulation of datas without any scientific approaches. The implication of demodex of BKC is already reported by many previous studies. The comparison of paediatric/adult forms of BKC did not have many results presented in the actual version.

1. The criteria for patients included for BKC is not clear. Even though BKC included a large spectrum of clinical manifestations, for a study, the author might offer his included criteria.

2. How to define 16 years as the limits of the paediatric/Adult forms? I don't understand the interests of comparing the two populations, because the physiopathology is different. The reliability of paediatric exams was not persuasive.

3. The eyelashes-removed demodex method has too many limits, for it can miss the demodex accumulated at the follicles of eyelashes.

4. Anti-virus treatment had the relationship with BKC?

5. Tha analysis of tear of impression cytology could be practiced in order to enhance the study, not just by simple slit lamp analysis.

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.
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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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