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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. In the methods section, the authors need to address two issues. Firstly, whether the use of intravenous or oral sedation was used as this will confound the results. Secondly, the methods of applying TV and LG should be stated more precisely eg. the quantity of drug, the generic and brand name of the drugs etc.

2. The authors used the student t-test to analyze the results but the data may not be Normally distributed. A non-parametric statistical test should be used instead.

3. Results. The P value of the mean age comparison should be stated.

4. Results. The mean time taken for the cataract surgery should be stated and compared among the surgeons. Any significant difference should be addressed in the discussion.

5. Results. The mean visual analog pain score among the surgeons should be stated. Any significant difference should be addressed in the discussion.

6. Results. The results on intraoperative complications were unclear. The authors reported a very low complication rate of 0.02% and 0.03% for the TV and LG groups respectively. However, how these values were obtained are unclear. Also, the authors should define more precisely what is "difficulty in IOL implantation" and what the "other minor complications are.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The site of the surgical incisions should be mentioned in the methods and results.

2. Discussion. The authors mentioned that the limitation of Amiel et al was the subjective assessment by the patient. This was exactly the same limitation in the current study and this should be rephrased.

3. Table 1. The exact number should be stated in the table instead of using percentages.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Methods, Primary Outcome Measure. Suggest to change the term "blind" to "masked".
2. Entire manuscript. The P value should be reduced to 2 significant figures eg. $P=0.2466$ to $P=0.25$.
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