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Author’s response to reviews:

What was already known about the topic concerned?

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), refractive errors are the leading cause of treatable visual loss in all age groups worldwide. Hyperopia, which causes mild and moderate visual loss and asthenopia is quite prevalent in the population of school-age children. There are many studies on associated factors and prevalence of hyperopia in children, yet a systematic review summarizing this knowledge is not available. A systematic review on the subject is essential for defining policies towards correction of hyperopia in children, and also to identify methodological limitations of the existing studies and gaps in knowledge about this subject.

What new knowledge the manuscript contributes?

Although the studies have similar methodologies, the prevalence of hyperopia presents great variability. Studies consistently show the inverse association of age with hyperopia. This ametropia is more common in children of Caucasian origin, in those who live in rural areas and spent more time in outdoor activities. There is no consensus on the association between gender, family income and parental education and hyperopia among children. The identified associated factors don’t seem to explain the great variability in the prevalence of hyperopia. Thus, this manuscript suggests the need for standardization of future studies and recommends the use of the RESC Protocol (Refractive Error Study in Children) for the classification of hyperopia. The variability in the prevalence of hyperopia among children needs to be better assessed in relation to age (stratification of children by specific age) and ethnicity in order to enable the consistency analysis of the studies.

Changes in manuscript

The manuscript was revised to follow PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews. It was add “systematic review” in the title
It was changed “introduction” for “background” in the abstract and in the main text.
The objectives and methods followed PICOS characteristics.
The citations were provided in the tables.
A conclusion paragraph was provided.