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2. Patients were either basic or pseudodivergence excess XT. Those are 2 different groups. This can create a selection bias.

3. Authors defined overcorrection as ET over 10 PD. A patient with intermittent exotropia and possible normal foveal near fixation who resulted in overcorrection may become monofixator. A range of 10PD +/- to define over and under correction is very soft criteria especially in patients with intermittent exotropia.

4. Although not significantly different (tendency 0.08) Group A patients postoperative follow up was almost 1 year longer than group B patients.

5. Groups were not different to begin with. There was a significant large angle of deviation in Group A patients

6. Results. These 2 groups cannot be compared. Group B patients already had undergone another surgery for XT. The impact that first surgery had on the group is not known

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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