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Reviewer's report:

In this paper, the authors describe the development and validation of a new tool to measure client satisfaction with surgical lens extraction and multifocal lens implantation, focussing on one outcome measure, namely satisfaction with Freedom from Glasses. The aim of the study is well defined.

Major compulsory revisions

1. The methods section describes in detail the statistical tests employed to reduce the number of items and to analyse data. However, several major points are missing from the methods. The most important is patient selection – the only information the authors give is that patients had surgery at least one year prior to questionnaire administration, and that they had not suffered per- or postoperative complications. The paper should include whether patients were a consecutive series, how many surgeons operated on these patients, and what the indication for surgery was. It appears that the patient cohort was a mixed group of individuals suffering from cataracts (reduced vision for distance and near, plus specific other symptoms) and other undergoing surgery for presbyopia (reduced vision for near, reading glasses required). These two groups would have very different expectations from surgery, and are also likely to report outcomes very differently.

Selection bias could also derive from patients declining to take part in the study. The paper should mention how many patients were originally approached, and how many took part.

2. As for the questionnaire itself, the methods section does mention that it was generated based on patient interviews. Again, more details would be helpful – who conducted these? How many patients were interviewed?

For this study, the tool was administered by phone. By whom? How many observers were involved? How did patients select their response on the 5-point-Likert scale (numbers, or were the answers read out to them for each question)? How long did questionnaire administration take on average?

Minor essential revisions

1. The results section in itself is sound. However, it is difficult to judge the significance of the findings without knowing details about patient selection. The authors mention that 87% of patients did not require glasses after surgery, and
that these individuals had higher scores. This leads back to the question about expectations from surgery. Presbyopia-only individuals would undergo surgery solely to get out of their glasses, and would be more disappointed if this target was not reached. More details are needed about the 13% who did have to wear glasses postoperatively – if the aim of surgery was full refractive correction, why did these patients require glasses postoperatively, and how might these reasons affect the satisfaction score?

Other comments

The manuscript does adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. The discussion and conclusions are fairly well balanced and adequately supported by the data, but omit discussing the points raised above. Some limitations of the work are clearly stated, such as the lack of prospective data collection and evaluation of basic aspects of any test, such as test-retest reliability, inter- and intra-observer variability etc.

The authors acknowledge that this work has previously been presented at a meeting; it does not build on previous publications.

Title and abstract accurately convey what has been found, and the writing is acceptable.
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