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Reviewer’s report:

While the authors have not found statistical significance between the 2 intraocular lens formulas and this was the primary area of interest comments concerning the refractive process and the motivation for selecting a particular refractive result should be included.

Subjective refraction is clearly difficult in the younger ages and should be compared to objective means such as retinoscopy, with the differences between these two discussed. Thus we currently have no indication of the accuracy of the refractive evidence supplied.

The second issue has been alluded to but not addressed. Should these eyes be implanted for a desired neutral, hyperopic or myopic result? What about the potential for monovision in the uniocular cases? Should the desired refraction be different for a 3 year old as compared to a 10 year old? Is this different in cases where the fellow eye is myopic or hyperopic.

The authors have an opportunity to explore these issues, enhancing the value of their effort.
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