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Reviewer's report:

All 272 patients in this paper were sporadic cases over 8 years. It is a large scale. In this study, according to the severity of EKC all patients were classified into three grades this new clinical grading criterion has an important guiding value for clinical diagnosis and treatment.

Here are some questions:

1. In Conclusions: "The adult must be treated actively and timely because of the high risk of turning to the severe degree and the high incidence of corneal lesion."

But there were only 14 cases, 11 cases, and 24 cases in the other three groups. It is not enough to say they are less possible to turn to severer degree. This conclusion may be misleading viewers to think that it's not important to treat other groups.

Please modify this conclusion.

2. Please check for grammatical mistakes such as the instructions for Figure1 and 2.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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