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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting article concerning biofilms on lacrimal stents, and I believe it is worthy of publication if revisions are made. First of all, other studies have shown that the primary organism often responsible for silicone stent infection and biofilm formation in the lacrimal setting is atypical mycobacteria. Please refer to Samimi et al in the OPRS journal, 29:376-81, 2013, and 32:452-57, 2016. The study would have been more useful if the authors had also included this bacterium in their study. There are a lot of mistakes in the writing of the manuscript. For example, on page 8, line 35, the authors refer to one study reporting crystal violet detection of biofilm formation, yet they reference two studies. Likewise, authors use the phrase "and so on" a few times in the manuscript, and that does not actually impart any useful information. In Table 1, the authors examined optical density according to time for all organisms except S. pneumonia for 12 weeks. S. pneumonia was only tested for 7 weeks. No explanation is given for this difference in testing protocol. Figure 1 can be eliminated. Figure 3 needs better captions to explain exactly what the authors are trying to show, as it seems somewhat confusing.
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