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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study reporting the effect of varying concentrations of povidone iodine on bacterial growth during speech.

The authors conclude that lower than 5% povidone iodine may not be effective in reducing bacterial load.

As mentioned in the discussion section, there are some limitations like identification of bacterial species, in vitro design etc. and they decrease the scientific value of this interesting research.

I have still some concerns to be addressed;

1. Why did not the participants receive an upper tract sampling or nose and throat examination before study? What kind of similarity exists between ocular flora and upper tract flora, please give detailed information.

2. Why did you choose only one type of agar?

3. Why was the agar first coated with povidone iodine solution and later tested?

4. Did gender or age of the participants have an effect on the results of the study?

5. We know that ocular surface and eyelid flora are primarily related with endophthalmitis cases. Povidone iodine concentration of 5% seems to reduce speech related bacterial load and seems to be effective for this part of the procedure, so could it also be enough for the ocular flora? This is only the lowest concentration to be used.

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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