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Reviewer's report:

General
Interesting topic. Toric IOLs (TIOL) become more and more popular for cataract surgeons. The well known AcrySof with a TIOL posterior surface promises good implantation results.

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1) The used method to evaluate the TIOL rotation angle was the slitlamp beam method using a Haag Streit slit lamp. The smallest unit of the Haag Streit slit lamp angle is 15°. A measurement of TIOL rotation can only be performed with a precision of 7.5°. How do the authors receive results of -1° or + 1° rotation angle?

2) If the measurement method was only an angle measuring eyepiece at the slit lamp - How could the authors avoid the eyes cyclorotation or changes of the head position? Only this systematic failure can lead to an false measurement of ten and more degrees!

3) Please, investigate photographs of the TIOL and use an overlay technique to evaluate the real rotation angle (e.g. iris structures, limbal vessels...).

4) To achieve better statistical results, please present a larger number of implanted IOLs T3, T4, T5, otherwise the p-values should be larger than 0.05.

5) The discussion is incomplete: Other groups showed smaller rotations of the MicroSil (please discuss your reference no.11). There are other designs in the market: Rayner centerflex, iris claw lenses... (Viestenz et al. Toric intraocular lensens and correction of astigmatism. Ophthalmologe 2007, 107: 620-627)

6) Was there a change of the astigmatic axis observed (comparing preop and postop axis as an indirect indicator of IOL rotation between week one and month 3 postop)?

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

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

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1) discussion: line 19: "a stigmatically neutral"

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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