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Reviewer’s report:

The author described that clinical outcomes appear equivalent with LenStar to those reported in the literature for manual keratometry and somewhat better than has been reported for some previous automated instruments.

Lenstar is measure nearer to the center of the cornea and at much more point than the previous instruments, so the results are not surprising, but well-documented.

Only minor essential revisions are necessary.

Abstract:

I missed preoperative cylinder data from the results.

You mentioned 3 months and 6 months in the abstract. Which is the correct one? Do you think, 3 months is enough for such a conclusion? Have you got data 6 months postoperatively?

You mentioned that previously calculated surgically induced astigmatism for the surgeon was used. I think this can be a reason for postoperative data error: temporal, superior and oblique incisions have different SIAs. As you wrote, all incisions were made at 12h position in your study, and in this case it is correct!

In the Method section, you have to write statistical tests, not only the software’s name. What kind of vector analyzes was performed?

You mentioned that SIA was a mean of 0.47 D, but there was a patient with 2.75 D of SIA. Do you know what was the exact reason, because I think it would be important to examine it (not in the present manuscript). This can be pointing ahead, because every surgeon has such cases and it is worth to examine individually (patient age? unusual WTW? non-average corneal thickness? long incision?).

4 eyes received a lens that was not based on the calculations from the Lenstar. Then the table 2, and the paragraph reporting this table is unnecessary in the manuscript.

Were there statistical changes in astigmatism during the postoperative period (1 month vs. 3 months)? If no, why we are afraid about long-term changes about astigmatism, SIA etc...?
Anyway, the manuscript is a well-written report with very small patient number.
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