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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. If the authors’ purpose was to investigate the effect of a mydriatic-cocktail soaked cellulose sponge on perioperative pupil diameter in tamsulosin-treated patients undergoing elective cataract surgery, why they included control patients not taking any #1 adrenergic receptor inhibitors? Previous studies indicated that the use of a wick pre-soaked in standard mydriatic and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs was as effective or superior to the conventional repeated instillation of drops before cataract surgery.

2. There is no sample calculation.

3. I suggest a table summarizing the demographic data. Please include gender. This table must include a column with the “P” of each variable.

4. I suggest a flow chart diagram (ex.: CONSORT flow chart).

5. It’s important to include all statistical analysis comparing the difference between the groups (age, hypertension, diabetes, gender, Preoperatively/ After nucleus delivery/ Before IOL implantation pupil diameter grading, mean operation time, )

6. The table of intraoperative data must include an additional column with the “P” of each variable.

7. The sentence “There was no significant difference in pupillary diameter preoperatively and after nucleus delivery, however before IOL implantation, pupil was significantly smaller in group 1 as compared to group 3 (p=0.0084)” is not necessary if the table intraoperative data include the “P”.
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