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Reviewer's report:

Response to reviewer: Thanks for your comment! For this study, refractive error was assessed using 'Autorefractor'. The value considered as emetropia was 6/6 vision. We have included this information in the latest revised version of manuscript as well.

This sentence it is not correct since the autorefractor do not give the visual acuity. The visual acuity of 6/6 it is not a signal of emetropia since hyperops can have a good visual acuity. This must be clarified.

Response to reviewer: For this study, refractive error was assessed using autorefractor and 6/6 vision was considered as emetropia. Participants were considered as having myopia or hypermetropia when spherical equivalent refractive error was less than −0.50 dioptres or more than +0.50 dioptres respectively. However, in some cases ophthalmologists made a general diagnosis, instead of more specific one. As data entry and analysis was done based on the diagnosis the ophthalmologists made, authors did not have scope to categorize refractive error further.

I think it is important to have all the refractive error categorized.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

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

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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