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Comments to Authors:

Minor Essential Revisions

The following are comments regarding the revised manuscript. This is a prospective observational study reporting the incidence of endophthalmitis with and without intracameral cefazolin. The reduction in the rate of endophthalmitis is impressive with intracameral cefazolin. The authors are to be congratulated on magnitude and important finding of this study. The following suggestions may improve the manuscript:

1. There are still spelling errors.
   a. Page 1, under key words “cefazolin” is misspelled as “cefazoline.”
   b. In the abstract, under Method: 11696 patients should be 11,696 patients; 13305 should be 13,335; “in who a 1mg/0.1 bolus” should be “in whom a 1mg/0.1 bolus.”
   c. In the abstract, under Results: “The relative risk (RR) for endophthalmitis in Group 1 against group 2 was 11.45 95% CI 5.72-22.84, p<0.001.” is one long sentence that needs separation. For example, it should be “The relative risk (RR) for endophthalmitis in Group 1 against group 2 was 11.45 [95% CI 5.72-22.84] (p<0.001).”
   d. Consider changing the Conclusion of the abstract to something like this instead: “Conclusions: An intracameral bolus injection of cefazolin (1 mg in 0.1 ml solution) at the conclusion of cataract surgery significantly reduced the rate of postoperative endophthalmitis.”
   e. The above are just some examples from the abstracts. There are still numerous grammatical errors in the manuscript and spelling errors in the references (even those referenced in the response letter). Please be sure to revise the manuscript to the English standard of written journal articles.

2. There is still a lack of discussion regarding why the rate of endophthalmitis for group 1 is so high at 0.63%. Most published reports has the rate at 0.1% or less. Although the authors provided an explanation and referenced published papers
regarding the high rate of endophthalmitis in the response letter to the editor, this discussion needs to be in the manuscript and include the references reporting the high rate of postoperative endophthalmitis.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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