

August 5, 2013

Umit Ubeyt Inan, MD  
Editor-in-Chief  
World Journal of Ophthalmology

Dear Dr. Umit Ubeyt Inan:

I would like to thank you as well as the Editorial Board and Reviewers for taking in consideration our manuscript entitled "Keratoconus Therapeutics Advances" as a revised paper. I really appreciate your time and effort in reviewing this submission.

Please find as follows the revision with the changes needed as recommended by the referees.

If you require additional information or clarifications, please let me know at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully,

Alejandro Navas, MD, MSc  
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology  
Department of Cornea and Refractive Surgery  
Institute of Ophthalmology "Conde de Valenciana"  
Chimalpopoca #14, Colonia Obrera, 06800  
Mexico City, Mexico  
Tel: (+5255) 5442 1700  
Ext: 3710 (Cornea and Refractive Surgery)  
Fax: (+5255) 5578 9748  
E-mail: dr.alejandro.navas@gmail.com

Dear reviewers:

In first place, we would like to thank you for your comments. In this next section, we are going to answer every recommendation.

Reviewer 00505064:

1. While your suggestion about the title is accurate, we consider that a shorter title could express the same purpose of the article.
2. The article by Jhanji et al. was added to the references as suggested.
3. The signed paragraph was changed as you suggested.
4. AVMC was changed to CDVA and expanded as needed.
5. We performed an exhaustive review of the grammar and syntax of the entire text and we changed the phrase as you suggested.
6. We changed the error in the phrase.
7. We added a section that points exactly our concern about the treatment of low grade ametropia in this patients.

8. We expanded as needed PMMA.
9. We changed microns as you suggested.
10. Where was changed to were as you suggested.

Many thanks for your help and support.

Reviewer 00505116:

We would like to thank your kind recommendations about this article. As you suggested, we performed an exhaustive review of the grammar and syntax of the entire text and we changed some sections.

About the search criteria, we performed a search in pubmed that included Only peer reviewed articles from 2005 until now and specifically our search included the next keywords: keratoconus, keratoconus suspect, treatment, long term results...

About the quality of the articles included, we consider for our purposes, articles related to therapeutic advances and new techniques for the treatment in keratoconus, that's why in our article there are controlled articles and also case reports and we do not considered necessary for our descriptive purposes to give each a qualification. Our purpose with this paper was to inform to the ophthalmologic community the new approaches that are being used in the world for keratoconus treatment.

About the fact that we did not include in the paper the search strategy we can tell that this article is not pretending to be a systematic review, and there are so many articles like this that do not include that section in the text (Jhanji V, Sharma N, Vajpayee RB. Management of keratoconus: current scenario. Br J Ophthalmol 2010;95(8):1044-50.).

Thank you very much for your time and efforts in reviewing this manuscript.