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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential revisions

Abstract
1. page 3 “..refine concept of hyperopic refractive error..” Do the authors wish to convey that there are other associations with hyperopia such as accommodative and binocular functions, rather than seek another definition of hyperopia?

Background
2. page 4 “..Thus, children with hyperopia may present symptoms related to asthenopia..” Please clarify the degree of hyperopia as the symptoms mentioned, and the risk of amblyopia, are usually related to higher levels of hyperopia. Implying that these occur at all levels of hyperopia would be misleading and overstate the impact of hyperopic refractive error. Please note that grammatical corrections are required for this statement.

3. page 4 “Hyperopic children may present anisometropia if asymmetry occurs..” As anisometropia of any degree is not uncommon and usually well tolerated, it would be important to clarify that anisometropia is significant for visual development with higher dioptre differences. The mention of emmetropisation in this context appears out of place.

4. page 4 “Although there are several studies on hyperopia, so far..” would flow more smoothly as a new paragraph.

Methods
5. “..07 papers were included from selected articles” – this seems to imply only 7 papers were included in the analyses, but 40 was stated elsewhere (in figure 1), and then later it was reported 11 studies were included in the meta-analysis, weren’t all papers included in the meta-analyses?

Results
6. Page 8. “I2 indicates homogeneity among the studies..” The I2 was 0% for ages 10 and 12 and 13 yrs, but the hyperopia prevalence at these ages in figure 2 look fairly homogenous. Please explain this discrepancy

Conclusion
7. “More studies are needed to refine the concept of hyperopic refractive error with evaluation of accommodative..” This last statement appears inconsistent
with the flow of the manuscript. As there was no mention of performing any measures of accommodation or testing of binocularity within the paper, to reach this conclusion seems out of place. Additionally, a number of researchers, including Atkinson et al (Atkinson J, Anker S, Nardini M et al. Infant vision screening predicts failures on motor and cognitive tests up to school age. Strabismus 2002 vol 10, no 3. 187 – 198) have undertaken important studies on developmental aspects of children with refractive error, and these studies should be included if there is to be a detailed discussion on cognitive development.

Figure 1
8. the numbers do not add up for the last division of the tree diagram (77 papers, after excluding 44 full text articles but leaving 40 studies)

Figure 2
9. please see comment 6

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests