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Q1.
Authors addressed and made corrections. No comments

Q3-Q4.
Comparing preoperative data between Group A and preoperative surgery #1 Group B in my will simply make this paper stronger. Did Group A patients did better than Group B first surgery. And if yes (since no second surgery was needed), why. It will help me as a reader decide when an R-R is needed as a second surgery. A before any surgery and group

Q5.
Authors addressed and made corrections. No comments

Q6.
Authors indicate the following "When we decided the surgical dosage of recess-resect, we refer to the preoperative angle of deviation at distance and near.". However, their methodology section says something different "All of the surgeries were performed by a single surgeon (D.G.C.) under general anesthesia according to the formula modified from the surgical table suggested by Parks (based on the angle of exodeviation at distance, Table 1) [18]. R&R was performed on the non-dominant eye in group A and on the unoperated eye in group B. In group B, all patients had undergone the unilateral R&R as primary surgery for intermittent exotropia"

Q8.
Authors addressed and made corrections. No comments
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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