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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study and could have implications on the sterilization protocol of equipment used with phacoemulsification machines.

Major/Minor revisions:

1) The methods could be better described because it is unclear how you came to the conclusion that the cassette was the source of the infection. Further explanation of how the data was collected and the timing of the collection would be helpful. At that time of diagnosis of endophthalmitis after cataract surgery, how was the original tubing and cassette recovered for culture?

2) It is mentioned that the source of the bacteria was the contaminated drainage cassette. How can that be concluded if a new drainage bag or cassette is used everyday as stated in the Methods section? Also, a better diagram about how there is a connection between aspiration and irrigation could be helpful in visualizing how the tubes can become contaminated.

3) Please describe any inclusion or exclusion criteria if any. Were patients excluded if they did not have the minimum follow up time of 12 months?

4) Can you explain why visual prognosis was not good for diabetic patients in this study in the discussion section?

5) Under “treatments” section, how was the decision to proceed with PPV or IOL exchange made? What was the clinical criteria?

6) What is the recommendation in sterilization technique and use of tubing by the company making the phacoemulsification machine? How is this machine different from the other ones that are being used at the same hospital?

7) Please explain any limitations to the study.

8) It would be interesting to compare the patients who developed endophthalmitis from the organism versus the patients who did not even though the same phacoemulsification machine was used. Did these patients have different risk factors?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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