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Reviewer's report:

1) The use of language should be improved. There are significant grammatical errors.

Introduction

1) The principles of Ocular Response Analyzer should be explained more clearly. The terms IOPg, IOPcc and corneal hysteresis need further explanation.

Discussion

1) Meta-analysis data has shown that there is significant difference between preoperative IOPcc and IOPGAT measurements. As Goldmann applanation tonometry is considered gold standard for calculating intraocular pressure, the significant difference between IOPcc and IOPGAT puts the reliability of the IOPcc results into question, which was not discussed.

2) Following the statement above, even though it is shown that IOPcc was the least varied measurement following surgery, the postoperative data given by ORA might still be due to preoperative overestimation of intraocular pressure.

3) There is no mentioned gold standard method to compare the post refractive intraocular pressure measurements. Therefore, assuming IOPcc as the closest to actual intraocular pressure due to its unaffected status in postoperative measurements relative to IOPg and IOPGAT is vague.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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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