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Reviewer's report:

General

----------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Comments to authors

The authors have made changes to the manuscript which improves the clarity.

Introduction

This paper describes a small study investigating the efficacy of multiple drops of mydriatic agents compared to depot drug administration. The question posed by the authors is not new although the study claims to be more rigorous than previous.

Discussion

The description of the Ong-Tone reference is confusing and does not make sense to me.

‘Ong-Tone showed that satisfactory pupillary dilatation was achieved when mydriatic-soaked wicks were used, as compared with standard drop instillation [6]. The main outcome measure was that pupils were noted to be adequately or inadequately dilated following either method of pre-operative mydriasis (the definition of what constituted an adequately or inadequately dilated pupil was not given). The study method was statistically found to be no different to drop instillation, in terms of poorly dilated pupils. There was no mention of blinding nor randomisation, nor was there any numerical data on the sizes of the pupils achieved with either method. As a result we found it difficult to draw sound conclusions from this study. We deliberately designed our study to be conducted in a prospective, randomised, single-blind case controlled manner, in order to exclude bias.’

The first sentence above states the study outcome, but the author’s later claim that ‘it is difficult to draw sound conclusions from this study.’ Which is it?

The rest of the sentences are confusing. I am not sure what was done in the Ong-Tone study. I suggest that this section is re-written.

Specific comments

Student’s T-test is usually written as Student's t-test

The authors use data as singular, it is plural. However, some journals will now accept data as singular. Check with the editor.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

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