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Reviewer's report:

The authors have revised their manuscript according to the reviewers’ suggestions. There are several questions still need further explanation and revision.

1. In abstract, conclusions, “Demographic characteristics, including sex, age, and educational attainment…”, are there any other factors should be added, for example, income? Or the authors should be more specific: “Among all the demographic characteristics, sex, age, and educational attainment…”

2. The introduction is a little bit redundant. This part should be shortened, better within one page.

3. The authors chose age-related cataract patients as subjects. So it should be more specified in description. Please add “age-related” in title, abstract and relevant part in the manuscript.

4. On page 5, Methods, Population, the inclusion criteria, “patients aged 40 years or older; the presence of age-related cataract…”. Age-related cataract should be diagnosed in old patients, so the age of the patients should be limited as the aged people. Furthermore, “the presence of age-related cataract…”, “Diagnosed as age-related cataract…” should be more proper.

5. On page 6, paragraph 1, “which provided the diagnostic basis for selecting eligible patients” should be deleted.

6. On page 6, paragraph 3, “All patients were questioned…”, “evaluated” should be better.

7. On page 7, paragraph 2, first sentence does make sense and redundant, please delete.

8. On page 13, paragraph 1, cataract surgery mostly operated on outpatients in Taiwan and Japan. So the difference between “outpatient” and “inpatient” may not be the major reason which caused the difference in scores. Are there any other possible reasons?

9. On page 13, line 11 and 18, the authors compared the difference between their research and the study in Greece. Why discussed separately? Should the authors add the detailed description of patients in line 11, because they had done in line 18.

10. The discussion is still too long, please refine it. Shorten by 30% would be more appropriate.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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