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Reviewer's report:

It is a good work to compare Habitual and i.Scription refraction, with finding any correlation with night visual discomfort, But there are some notes that do not affect the quality of this work.

1- Introduction is very long, it is better to be brief.
2- Please explain the definitions of Habitual refraction, subjective, manifest, and i-scription.
3- More details about habitual refraction were needed " the standard equipment, the standard procedure, and the standard eye chart".Line 29, page 7.
4- Line 19, page 8, "only the best measurement was chosen". What did you mean by the best measurement?
5- Please refer to table 1 in your results.
6- Discussion did not discuss all the items of the results, with some lack of other related researches.
7- Your conclusions in the manuscript were deficient and differed from that of the abstract.

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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