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Introduction

- A very long introduction. Focus to the main keywords.

Subjects and Methods

- The authors did not mention about date of this study and the study design.
- It is important to state degree of refractive errors allowed to be included in this study.
- Need to explain clearly about the questionnaire.
- The sample size was VERY SMALL for this study design.
- Clear definition of manifest subjection and habitual refraction is necessary.
- The authors were supposed to complete the ocular examination to ensure that their patients did not have organic ocular diseases before conducting refraction assessments.
- Please mention ways to minimize errors in your study.

Results

- Demographic and baseline clinical data (especially refractive status) are important.
- It is expected that the authors will present baseline clinical data in the subjects first, then followed with results illustrating the study objectives.

Discussion and Conclusion
- Need more comparison with other published studies.

**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.

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 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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