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Answers to Biomed Central reviewers comments

Before answering to reviewer’s comments, I would like to thank them to have detailed look into my our study and the recommendation made and critical points noted and advised for correction. This will improve the quality of study.

Answer to 1st reviewers comments

1- As mentioned to only mention the overall movement score and not all the four quadrants individually, while doing designing of the study we have taken references from other studies and in those studies results have been mentioned in all four quadrants, as there is a possibility that one or more quadrants may not have akinesia, so in our opinion it will be good to mention all the four quadrants results.

2- Sentence added which was missed in method section that makes the sentence clear.
Answer to 2\textsuperscript{nd} reviewers comments

Major Compulsory revision.

1- The secondary outcome i.e. No difference in groups in terms of haemorrhage, chemosis, and intraocular pressure was found has been added in conclusion.

2- Reference for using vernier calliper has been added. Vernier calliper has been used in several studies but I have inserted one ref for that.

3- It was the same surgeon who did the measurements and all assessments.

4- I have looked into and the confusion is because the way the sentence has been written. I have rewritten the sentence. In group 1 the initial measurement was done after 3 and then 6 minutes of the injection. In group 2 patients had first injection of 3 mls and pressure for 2 minutes was applied and then second injection of 2 mls was done and then immediately the first measurement was done, so it was 3 minutes from the initial injection and then second was done after three minutes after the first measurement or six minutes from initial injection. From the sentence it looks as the initial measurement in group 2 was done before the second injection, which is not the case. I have rewritten the sentence to clear that confusion.

5- We did patients satisfaction score as completely satisfied, satisfied or unsatisfied and there was no statistically significant difference found. The details are added in methods, and conclusion and in table 2.

6- Consort flow diagram about randomisation Statement is intended to improve the reporting of a randomized controlled trial. Still studies are being published with no mention of consort flow diagram. I have included some recommendations from the www.consort-statement.org in title. In inclusion and exclusion criteria details of patients to be included or
excluded are already mentioned. In our study, none of the patients who were randomised to either group refused to be included at the time of procedure, nor the planned procedure changed or patients anaesthesia technique was changed, that is also the reason that consort diagram not included.

**Minor Essential revision**

1- Term blinded changed to masked where possible.

2- Last Sentence completed in method section in abstract.

3- Excess changed to access

4- Benoxinate spelling corrected

5- Moorsfields spelling corrected to moorfields

6- Stephens spelling changed to Stevens

7- Subconjunctivally deleted from sentence

8- Knowa changed to Kowa

9- Redial changed to medial

10- Statistically significant difference in terms of age and gender between groups mentioned in results section.

11- Statement on Sub-tenon block as being safer has being mentioned from the study, which is referenced, but there are cases reported with serious complication so word ‘relatively’ added before safer.