Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Comments and Suggestions for Authors:
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the paper of Xiaotong Ren et all tilted: "Long-term Changes in Corneal Endothelial Cell Density after 2 Ex-Press Implantation in Chinese Patients: by Contrast with Contralateral Eye".

Although the manuscript has a potential to be interesting, authors have made many typing errors which discourage the reader and suggest that it was written carelessly.

For example, in the names of authors and their affiliations:
"Xiaotong Ren,1, Jie Wang2, Xuemin Li1† and Lingling Wu 1*"
By the way: what does † mean?
Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. It is revised according to your suggestion.

There are also many errors in references section. Almost every reference in written in different style. For example:
31. Tojo N, Hayashi A. Ex-Press® versus Baerveldt implant surgery for primary open-angle glaucoma and pseudo-exfoliation glaucoma. INT OPHTHALMOL 2021; 41(3): 1091-1101.
32. Tojo N HAMA. Corneal decompensation following filtering 327 surgery with the Ex-PRESS® mini glaucoma shunt device. Clin Ophthalmol 2015.
Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. It is revised according to your suggestion.

Also, some important reference is missing, since the CECD loss after Ex-press was not only studied in Japanese, Korean, Italian and Canadian population but also in Polish: PMCID: PMC4475547
Reply: Thanks for your suggestion, and I agree with you. We had read the "PMCID: PMC4475547" before. The article titled "Prospective Randomized Study Comparing Combined Phaco-ExPress and Phacotrabeculectomy in Open Angle Glaucoma Treatment: 12-Month Follow-Up" assessed combined operation phaco-ExPress and phacotrabeculectomy, and the phacoemulsification have a certain impact on CECD loss. In our study, to avoid the impact of the crystalline lens status, patients with aphakic or pseudophakic eyes (including fellow eyes) were also excluded.

According to the journal style abstract should be unstructured.
Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. It is revised according to your suggestion.

The number of groups is very small. Please explain how you determined the sample size for the study? Was your study powered to obtain the results in terms of change in CECD? Did you perform a sample size analysis?
Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. It is revised according to your suggestion. The sample size was estimated according to the standard formula for mean comparison. α and β

were set as 0.05 and 0.1 respectively. Change rate of corneal endothelial cell density was selected as main outcome for sample size estimation. According to a previous study, it was estimated that 30 pairs of eyes were needed. Actually, based on the novelty of the treatment mentioned in the present research, the improvement could not be predicted with accuracy. Thus, the sample size calculated prior to the research might not be enough.

Lines: 154-156: "POAG patients showed a reduction of 11.9-31% in CECD compared with normal people. Our study showed that the decrease was 2.2% in shunt-implanted eyes and 1.8% in contralateral eyes at the 12-month follow-up. At the last follow-up time point (>2 years), the decreases were 5.0% and 3.2%, respectively." For me is a strong discrepancy. The study groups contain patients with glaucoma, but according to the authors results the CEDC was smaller than these cited in the literature. Please explain?

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion, and I agree with you. It may have been our clerical mistake before. We carefully reviewed the literature again, and found "POAG patients showed a reduction of 0.68-12.3% in CECD per year (the data include multiple treatment methods)". It is revised according to your suggestion.

The sentence in line 196:" Furthermore, few studies have compared shunt-implanted eyes with contralateral eyes" and line 151: "To our knowledge, this was the first study to compare CECD reduction after Ex-Press shunt implantation between both eyes of patients." are contradictory.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. Our original goal was to convey "there are no reports compared shunt-implanted eyes with contralateral eyes." It is revised according to your suggestion.

"In summary, the CECD reduction of Ex-Press shunt implanted eyes was similar to that of the contralateral eyes without surgery in this long-term follow-up study, even though both groups had significant CECD loss at the last follow-up time point (>2 years)" (lines 208-211) – I am sorry that I conclude, that your trial is not adequately powered to arrive at your stated conclusions.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. It is revised according to your suggestion.