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Reviewer's report:

The methodology of this article is reasonable generally.

It is reasonable to assume that the two machines have different principles (the topcon is a Hartmann-Shack aberrometer and the i-trace is a ray tracing aberrometer), so the results from two different machines cannot be interchangeable.

Although the HOA is largely influenced by the pupil size, But there is no comments about the pupil size of patient. The authors only mentioned that "aberrometer was measured based on the pupil of 4 mm without any treatment." There is no standard of the time of measurement and the illuminance of the room(where the measurement being performed) which can affect the pupil size. To assess the intrasession reproducibility of the HOAs measurements obtained by Topcon KR-1W and iTrace, observers should check the pupil size in each measurement time(by pupillometer) or mention the time of measurement or illuminance of the room.

If you proceeded with this study without considering the pupil size it can commit a big error.

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.
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**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/). 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