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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper which explores the important issue of shared decision making for the management of a particular type of strabismus.

Minor essential revisions

The terms “squint” and “strabismus” are used interchangeably. As the authors highlight, the term squint can be confused, so the term strabismus should be used throughout the manuscript.

Line 72 refers to a study due for completion in 2015, but there has already been a publication from this study which should be included:


With regards to the recruitment, is there any potential for bias recruiting from only two sites? Do they have the same protocols in relation to the care of these patients? It would be helpful to address this potential weaknesses related to the recruitment and sample sizes in the discussion.

Throughout the manuscript there are many examples of qualitative terms, such as “many”, “some”, “most” and “rarely” used to describe the data. It would be informative for the reader to provide the actual numbers – in particular as the sample sizes are not large (eg line 159 states “many sites” but the maximum is four). Or if the data is presented in one of the tables, refer the reader to the appropriate table.

Reference 22 is a website – I have just tried to access it but it doesn’t appear to be working, I simply get a message saying the webpage is not available.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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