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Reviewer's report:

Major essential revisions:

1. Discussion page 15. "Near activities increase the demand of the accommodative process.." This statement, and the two following it in the next paragraph unfortunately over simplifies the issue of how emmetropisation is achieved, and ignores previous findings of a lack of association between time spent reading, with refraction (Ip JM, Saw SM, Rose KA et al Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2008 Jul;49(7):2903-10.).

It should be clarified that the significant association cited is between parental reports of close reading distance (<30cm) and less hyperopic refraction (0.11D vs. 0.42D, p=0.0001).

Additionally, the supporting citations (3, 57, 59) are either theoretical or cross sectional studies, and should be considered inadequate support for this controversial viewpoint.

Minor essential revisions:

2. Background, line 3 "Thus, children may present symptoms related to asthenopia while reading.." The implication appears to be a reference to "children with hyperopia", so this should be stated.

3. Results, page 7, in the paragraph beginning "In most studies, the cut-off ..." please clarify if the studies reffered to are included or excluded studies.

4. Results page 12, in the paragraph beginning "spending time engaged in outdoor activities was slightly associated with hyperopia..", please modify the paragraph appropriately, as the authors use "our" and "we", when the study was undertaken by another research group, and not the current authors.

In the same paragraph, the authors should consider "reading distance" rather than "reading", as the parameter under study is distance between reader and reading material.

5. Discussion page 13. "..autorefraction is the best way of testing to diagnose ametropias.." the authors should consider modifying this statement to either "acceptable way" or else an alternative descriptor, as it appears contradictory when followed by the next sentence.
6. Figure 1 needs a title and legend
7. please check for minor grammatical and spelling errors still remaining in the manuscript

**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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