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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for addressing the questions raised in the initial review. However, there is one remaining point of concern in the category of major compulsory revision that still needs to be addressed fully.

Regarding the Discussion, 7th paragraph, 5th sentence. "This may not happen in practice....most of the patients are expected to adapt to the device and explantation would be a rare event...."

This statement requires revision or omission in order to keep the discussion neutral and legitimize the interpretation of the results. The point that "this may not happen in practice" is a subjective opinion based on speculation without acknowledging that implantation of the prosthesis requires complicated surgery. History has taught us that there have been less complicated surgical procedures involving implantation of prosthetics in the world of ophthalmology that end up having unexpected complications 5 years or 10 years later. It should be declared that these long term complications are unknown variables that cannot be accounted for when 2 years of data is used to model a 25 year projection. Furthermore, the assumption that "patients are expected to adapt to the device" is only 1 variable associated with explantation and should not be used as the only reason for explantation in the long term.

Later in the Discussion, you state "This study shares the general limitations of economic modeling." This is also an area to be more clear about the short comings of using 2 years of data to model a 25 year projection.
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