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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is constructive to MGD treatment and clinical significant. However there is still some problems.

Had the sample size of this study been calculated? Without a strong sample size, the data couldn't prove the result that one method is better that another.

"Refractory" was not defined in inclusion criteria. And "(9) All patients had been informed of possible treatment-related complications and the possibility to be assigned to invasive treatment group." was not actually one criterion. This sentence was put in a not so proper placement.

3) When the data of all three groups were mentioned, it was better to mark the group name to each datum. Otherwise it would be confusing.

4) What did the "<" mark mean in the line of P in Table 1.

5) What was the criteria of retreatment?

6) In result part, "Besides, one patient occurred blepharokeratoconjunctivitis (BKC) during IPL treatment and was relieved after two-week administration of Tobradex." was mentioned. Which exact group was the BCK patient in? Since a severe inflammatory status is not suitable for IPL treatment, was the treatment stopped when BKC occurred?

7) What were the exact reason of two patients being lost to follow-up?

The reviewer is looking forward to the reply.

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.

Unable to assess

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:
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