

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15247

Title: Corneal transplantation: beyond the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00505222

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-18 17:18

Date reviewed: 2014-12-22 12:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I don't understand why this manuscript type is editorial. If it is not, please modify this article as the routine form of the review article. Otherwise, this is well-written article and I recommend it for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15247

Title: Corneal transplantation: beyond the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00505066

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-18 17:18

Date reviewed: 2014-12-31 16:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors reviewed a lot of reference and listed all recent methods of corneal transplantation, and compared the advances and disadvantages of those methods. Authors also highlight other ongoing studies such as artificial cornea and cellular transplantation. The title accurately reflect the major topic and content of the manuscript. The writing of manuscript is very good and there is no need for any language polishing. But it seems that there was less content of studies about building an artificial cornea with the artificial material and the stem cell. Please add more recent advance about artificial cornea and artificial corneal transplantation.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15247

Title: Corneal transplantation: beyond the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00505087

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-18 17:18

Date reviewed: 2015-01-02 17:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a very well written and comprehensive review of contemporary techniques for lamellar keratoplasty. I would unhesitatingly suggest its publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15247

Title: Corneal transplantation: beyond the horizon

Reviewer's code: 00505064

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-18 17:18

Date reviewed: 2014-12-27 18:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well-written. The length is not suitable for an Editorial.