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Reviewer's report:

It is fortunate that the pre-treatment between group subject characteristics were similar, and the explanation that this occurred despite subjects choosing their treatment is adequate. To the extent that the investigator was not masked is also adequately explained. The choice of prism power and the statistical outcomes have been clarified (tables).

Major Compulsory Revisions:

In including more figures (2-6) the authors intend to clarify the results but fail to explain how values were ‘chosen’ to be excluded as outliers, especially in figures 3, 4, and 5 where the outliers do not appear to lie that far from the box plot and if included, may cause the outcomes to be different. Were these outliers also excluded from statistical analyses?

Further questions also remain concerning how the HTS system was used. What logic was behind recommending subjects only use the training system so infrequently? What prism demand (BI or BO) was prescribed and performed? Did any of the subjects reach the limit of prism demand allowed by the width of their monitor? These questions should be considered because vision therapy, if performed properly, provides a functional cure for convergence insufficiency, whereas prism is only a crutch. Were the prism glasses worn during the testing sessions?

Minor Essential Revisions:

The legend for figure 1 is wrong.
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