Author’s response to reviews

Title: Kayser–Fleischer ring with keratoconus: a coincidence? A case report

Authors:

Peike Hu (peike.hu@163.com)
Lin Lin (icylinlin@zju.edu.cn)
Zhiyi Wu (361090557@qq.com)
Xiuming Jin (lzyjxm@zju.edu.cn)
Hailong Ni (2101092@zju.edu.cn)

Version: 2 Date: 06 Mar 2020

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Lingling Tian:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript again, we appreciate you and reviewers very much for your positive and detailed comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Kayser–Fleischer ring with keratoconus, a coincidence? A case report” (ID: BOPH-D-19-00414R1). We have studied the comments of you and Dr Sushmita Kaushik carefully, all the main corrections mentioned have been made using track changes in the paper. According to your advice, we have send our manuscript to the professional company (Nature Research Editing Service) for language service. Attached please find the revised and clean versions, which we would like to submit for your kind consideration. The responds to the reviewers comments are as following:

Reviewer Dr Sushmita Kaushik:

Comment 1: The first time the term is used in the main report, it has to be used in full form. Eg. KC as the first word.
Response: We have changed the first “KC” of the main report into “Keratoconus(KC)”. Line 40, page 3.

Comment 2: “Poor corrected visual acuity…” looks superfluous.
Response: It exactly be, so we have deleted these parts. Line 24, page 2 and line 50, page 3.

Comment 3: “no yellow staining of the sclera” should come later after the KF ring was seen, as a negative finding.
Response: Special thanks to you for your good comment, we have changed it as your advice. Line 51 and 55, page 3.
Comment 4: "Typical corneal topographical…." describe what you mean
Response: We have changed this sentence into another one “The parameters of both corneas were consistent with the typical characteristics of keratoconus”, we think this modification can more accurately express our meaning. Line 61, page 4.

Comment 5: "B-ultrasound…" appears to be for the eye when we read. Maybe its better to say abdominal USG
Response: Really thanks to you for your good comment, we have followed. Line 66, page 4; line 98, page 5.

Comment 6: "wore RGP," better to say RGP Contact lenses
Response: Maybe “RGP lenses” is more common. Line 28, page 2; line 70 page 4.

Comment 7: “Hamid Gharaeene” needs a reference
Response: Yes, we have modified it. Line 97, page 5.

I hope my answer and modification can make you satisfied. Once again, thank you very much for your suggestions and comments.
Best regards. Yours sincerely, Peike Hu
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