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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting article - and provides a reference for surgical dosage for a difficult condition.

However - some questions need to be addressed:

1. In the Introduction - the authors mention Cooper's dictum as the standard of treatment - while this is a very pertinent dictum even today, most current strabismologists believe in exploring the operated muscle and assess its status before planning re-surgery - authors may consider re-writing the introduction

2. In the methods - while stating the amount of deviations a positive number seems to indicate exotropia and a negative number denotes esotropia - this should be clearly mentioned in the methods

3. In the methods - it is not clear what is meant by 'the amount of lateral rectus muscle advancement was set at 1/4 of the larger deviation of distance and near' - since this is very important to the study and is also a part of the title of the manuscript - it should be better explained how the surgical dose was calculated - preferably with the help of an example

4. Results - the effect of advancement (as calculated PD/mm) seems to increase with time - do the authors postulate any reason for the same?
5. Discussion - Authors should consider revising the discussion to make it more lucid - for example - quoting studies before describing them - so that the reader is clear about which study is being discussed in each paragraph.

Another related study which can also be referenced is -


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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
**Declaration of competing interests**

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license ([http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal