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Reviewer's report:

The authors evaluated vision-related quality of life in Chinese cataract patients and analyzed its influencing factors though the Chinese version of the National Eye Institute Visual Function Questionnaire-25 in this manuscript. They found that BCVA was the most important factor in vision-related quality of life and visual impairment had more impact on the psychosocial life of the patients. Both age and education attainment influenced the quality of life in cataract patients. However, there are still some questions which should be concerned.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The introduction and discussion should be shortened and the discussion should focus more on the findings of the study. The impact of visual impairment on quality of life was already mentioned in the introduction and should not be repeated in such a detail in discussion for example. Also the paragraphs discussing the prevalence of cataract is not necessary and should be shortened. The details of CHI-NEI-VFQ-25 should be described in discussion.

2. The language of this manuscript has problems in description, fluency and grammar. It is confused in description of some sentences, for example in discussion, first paragraph, “The excessively low response rate (96.8%) regarding the driving subscale may have caused in the lower Cronbach # coefficient in this subscale” and second paragraph “On the whole,”. “The excessively high non-response rate (96.8%)” should be better. Please have English language usage reviewed by a native English speaker.

3. Part of the discussion seemed redundant and should be simplified. For example, discussion section, fifth paragraph, “BCVA in the better eye was the most important determinant associated with the steepness of the decrease in vision-related quality of life.” and “The results suggested that the BCVA in the better eye was significantly associated with the steepness of the decrease in vision-related quality of life.”. The two sentences means the same.

4. As regards the results section: influencing factors of the composite score and subscale scores. Please, reformulate this paragraph, because is not clearly stated. The positively related factors and negatively related factors should be listed separately.

5. The authors should describe the surgical complications and compared the BCVA (should be in logMAR for analyze). They also should analyze the relationship between surgical complications and questionnaire scores.
6. The authors should emphasized more on the clinical meaning of the results, and explain the difference compared with other researches (disease/countries).

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The mean BCVA before and after cataract surgery should be listed in the manuscript, and all the data should be converted in logMAR VA.
2. As regards the results section: influencing factors of the composite score and subscale scores. What do the authors mean when they state: "To control for the effect of visual acuity"? Please, reformulate this sentence, because is not clearly stated.
3. As regards the results section: General characteristics of the samples. “An income of 2000-3000 RMB was most common.” Do the authors means per month?
4. As regards the discussion section, seventh paragraph, “This study observed that the composite scores, the subscale scores of general health, near vision activities, distance vision activities, dependence, social function, and peripheral vision among participants in different age groups decreased from the younger age group to the older age group (P<0.05).” should be described as “This study observed that……peripheral vision are positively related with age”. Or the authors should list the scores in different age groups in table.
5. The results of SNK test was too long to be listed in the footnote in Table 2. Please simplify the results or described in the results section.
6. In table 3, foot note, “-: significantly negatively associated, P<0.05” should be “P>0.05”.
7. As the authors had listed the exact value of P, so there is no need to add * on the values.
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