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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1. There are several spelling errors on the title (cefalozine?), abstract (1994 or 1996?) and texts, also, error on references (#5,#7,#21 are a same article).
2. This is not a prospective study.
3. In the Method part: two groups or three groups?, Table 3 and 4 reversed?, What is the meaning "MIC<4 >32"? How to calculate MIC 3200ug/cc?
4. In the Results part: The percentage of Group 1 on table 2 is wrong. You do not have to describe every case of group 2. It is not the key part.
5. Authors should write their Methods and Results as a article, not a list.
6. In the Discussion part: The most important weak point is the incidence of endophthalmitis of group 1 is higher than the generally accepted rate (<0.2%). So. you got a significant ratio difference between 2 groups. The wound of cataract operation should be classified as sterile wound. Every surgeon should focus on the sterilized environment, esp., a university hospital. Too emphasize the potency of new antibiotics is wrong.
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