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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a well-written, concise manuscript that adds to the empirical literature on the effects of communicating research results to study participants. I have only a few comments that should be addressed prior to publication.

1. The authors should clarify throughout the manuscript that the findings for cortical cataracts were indeterminate/statistically non-significant. It is a bit confusing to read about the two statistically significant findings and have the third not mentioned. On this note, the overall hazard ratio for any lens event was 0.82 with a confidence interval of 0.68-0.98. It would be helpful to read more on why the investigators chose to not recommend supplement therapy given the significance of this finding.

2. Please cite the original study in the second sentence of the Methods section on pg. 4.
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