

May 2, 2020
Dear Editor,

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO:53594

Title:Comparison measurements of anterior chamber angle via Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography and Ultrasound Biomicroscopy

Authors: Ziyang Yu, Ting Huang, Lu Lu, Bo Qu

Thanks for revising the manuscript. Improvements have been made based on the suggestion of reviewer.

Responses to the Reviewer #1:

Comments: Interesting study.

Response: Thank you.

Responses to the Reviewer #2:

Comments: This is an interesting study of the comparison measurements of anterior chamber angle. I read the manuscript with great interesting. The manuscript is well written. I have no specific comments.

Response: Thank you.

Responses to the Reviewer #3:

Comments: There are no obvious clinical manifestations in the early stage of glaucoma; typical visual field defects or progressive loss of visual acuity and other symptoms may appear in the moderate or severe phase of glaucoma. At present, gonioscopy, anterior segment optical coherence tomography and ultrasound biomicroscopy are commonly used to evaluate anterior chamber angle. Anterior segment optical coherence tomography and other non-contact

imaging modalities provide a quick, user-friendly and objective non-invasive method of assessing the anterior segment parameters and anterior chamber angle and are well tolerated by the patient and correlates well with the information provided by gonioscopy. In this study, the authors evaluated the agreement, difference and correlation of chamber angle parameters such as angle opening distance and trabeculo-iris space area measured by anterior segment optical coherence tomography and ultrasound biomicroscopy. This manuscript is very well designed and the results are interesting. The evaluation procedures is listed in detail. Minor comments: 1. The images are in a low resolution, and some of the words in the figures are difficult to read. Authors should update the images. 2. Discussion is acceptable, but a little long. 3. A minor language editing is required.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. We have accepted your advice and revised it in our manuscript. (1) High resolution images was uploaded in the system. (2) We have reduced discussion length. (3) A language editing was provided by MedE.

Responses to the Science Editor:

Comments: Issues raised: (1) DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (2) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Response: Thank you. (1) DOI citation numbers had been added to the reference list. (2) The “Article Highlights” was added at the end of the main text.

Responses to the Editorial Office Director:

Comments: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. The author has provided the clinical trial registration statement. The CONSORT 2010 checklist should be uploaded.

Response: Thank you. It is a retrospective, cross section clinical study, we have uploaded the strobe statement.