

## Peer Review File

**Article information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aes-22-35>

### Reviewer Comments

Comment 1: In my opinion, this paper seems like a systematic review, and a PRISMA chart should be added and described, such as methods.

Reply 1: While an extensive literature search was completed, articles included were at the discretion of the primary authors rather than in a systematic review. The methods described are provided as requested for a narrative review.

Comment 2: I think that not only one database should have been explored.

Reply 2: While only one database was explored, PubMed contains the vast majority of peer-reviewed, published articles therefore we chose this as our database source.

Comment 3: Results in table 3 should have been described in the text.

Reply 3: Table 3 has been described and referenced in the text.

Comment 4: line 408 - what does the yellow box mean?

Reply 4: No yellow box is present.

Comment 5: figures - please clearly show the source of the pictures - own or from other publications? If yes, please also provide the consent to use them in this paper. The source of figures has to be provided in both the main text and under the figure - footnote, and a reference number has to be added. Also, if the figures were drawings, please provide if the patients' consent was obtained to use them in the article and ethical statement.

Reply 5: The source of all images other than that from the Vogt textbook are courtesy of Danielle Trief and Jennifer Hu, the two authors of this paper. Source of the figures have been included in the captions of each figure.

Comment 6: In line 420, please refer to the position "Vogt's original 1921 textbook Atlas of the Slit Lamp-Microscopy of 419 the Living Eye."

Reply 6: The position of the reference has been added, figure 11 from Chapter D, page 26.

Comment 7: I think that a dot should be put after the reference number.

Reply 7: Re-formatted with periods placed after reference numbers.

Comment 8: please add a limitation section and future perspectives

Reply 8: A limitation and future perspectives section has been added.

Comment 9: abstract should be corrected for a systematic review.

Reply 9: We feel that this paper is a narrative review given the broad nature of the review and no additional analyses were performed such as quantitative meta-analyses

of existing data.

Comment 10: Some typo mistakes have to be eliminated.

Reply 10: The work has been re-edited.