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Reviewer's report:

General comments to the authors

Consider revising the text to refer to number of patients first before the number of eyes, and not the reverse as currently presented. For example, in the methods lines 36-38, and in the results line 38-39.

Include page number along with the line numbering, to make it easier for revision in future

Minor specific comments to the authors

Background
lines 12-13. Consider using the word "not" instead of never, because as per now, the word never is too negative in this context: 'The refractive surgical management of hyperopia has never gained the widespread acceptance and popularity among patients or physicians that surgical management for myopia has achieved.'

Lines 18-20: Consider revising the sentence this way. It is not yet clear which of these layers plays a prominent role in this complication.
Line 21. Provide a brief introduction about mitomycin-C before you proceed with its use as in the current study.

Methods
Lines 9-14. Revise the statement to make it clearer to follow. From: "All patients were followed up for 1 year after the primary procedure and were scheduled for follow up visits at 1 day, 1-week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and 12 months postoperation for assessment by UDVA, cycloplegic refraction analysis, keratometry and analysis of the mean corneal thickness at the 6-mm optical zone by Pentacam.
To: All patients were followed up for 1 year after the primary procedure. Within this time frame, the patients were scheduled for follow up visits at 1 day, 1-week, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and at the 12 months period postoperation, for assessment by UDVA, cycloplegic refraction analysis, keratometry and analysis of the mean corneal thickness at the 6-mm optical zone by Pentacam.
In the first group….Please specify the exact group you are referring to, since you have already defined the groups (A and B) at this point.

Consider revising the sentence to: Irrigation with a balanced salt solution…

Consider listing the variables first before you refer to them… because as the statement currently reads, once is left to wonder which variables the authors are referring to.

Clarify why you performed the t test and Mann-Whitney U test

Authors should consider revising the way the results are presented by stating the number of patients rather than the percentage. The percentages can be included in parentheses along the numbers.

Please consider describing the results to a greater depth in the results section of the manuscript rather than just referring to the figures and tables.

Since it is the discussion, why not use the terminology 'MMC treated' and 'non-treat' groups instead of group A group B, to make it easier to cross-reference with other published studies.

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.

Yes

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:
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