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Reviewer's report:

1. The specification of three knives used in this study must be introduced. And, if possible, the author had better add the qualitative images of them.

2. In Materials of Methods, last paragraph is repeated twice. (“The dulled steel and silicon knives were ............ dulled on these knives.”)

3. "Each surgeon made eight incisions with silicon accurate depth knives, eight incisions with diamond LRI knives and two incisions with steel accurate depth knives"

--> Why did you make the difference in number of incision among three types of knives?

4. Visual Analog Scale (VAS)
   a) The smoothness of making the incision
   b) How well the curvature of the eye was tracked
   c) The control of the incision
   d) The overall incision quality
   e) The sharpness of the blade

--> The meaning of each questionnaire may be vague to the individuals. How can the participants estimated the sharpness of the blade? Grossly? It is better that the more defined informations for a VAS are added.
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