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Reviewer's report:

This paper will be interesting for readers, because the authors described this from the other standpoint. However, there are some points which statement are insufficient, so a referee hopes the authors revise this paper.

1. Why is there not 'Reference'?

Much research of computer aided diagnosis (CAD) system or medical image analysis has been reported in the world. And, there are lots of papers of CAD evaluation.

2. P.3 l.14 "The validity of...exists."

A referee thinks that a cataract is not a disease which is measured quantitatively. Because, it is difficult for physician to assess a cataract. Could you add any comments for readers and a referee?

3. The statement of the algorithm is ambiguous and a referee does not understand well. The authors should revise arranging the algorithm.

4. They should add five reviewers' information, which are kinds of occupation, experiences, age, etc..

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.