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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Since at least one included study is cross-sectional, authors should explain whether they assessed incidence or prevalence of cataract. Furthermore, the duration of follow-up should be specified, since it has a great influence on results.

The bibliographic search is not sufficiently detail to allow to be reproducible. It should be rewritten with more details (i.e. languages, keywords).

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
Line 19: please replace odd with odds
Line 20: the number of eligible studies as well as that of patients included should be moved to result section
Line 24: please provide OR and 95%CI also for CC and SPC.

Keywords
Line 29: please remove confidence interval and odd ratio

Background
Line 40: please remove "that"
Line 42: please remove "."
Line 42: please replace sinthesized with assessed, evaluated

Methods
Line 48: The statement "All human studies have been approved by China Ethics Committee and performed in accordance with the ethical standards." is not clear and not applicable to a systematic review.
Line 61: risk ratio and odds ratio are two different statistics, and therefore not exchangeable. the authors should state which one they used
Line 70: see line 19 comment
Line 77: please replace egger's with Egger's.

Results
The random-effect model is preferred to fixed-effect when a high heterogeneity is detected. It is not clear whether the heterogeneity reported, translating in a I2 of 70.2% refers to random- or fixed-effect model. In both cases it should be better investigated.

Please replace randomized with random

Please report the exact p-value instead of p>0.05.

See line 109 comment

Please report the exact p-value instead of p>0.05.

Discussion

Please remove ".

The statement "Despite these limitations, the present study clearly identified the positive correlation of cataract risk and T2D, which draw attention into the eye extermination of T2D patients" should be attenuated

Conclusions

Replace confirms with suggests

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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