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Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The study aimed to evaluate the effects of anterior capsular opening size on deviation from predicted refraction and the effective position of intraocular lens (ELP) in cataract surgery. Despite the clinical significance of this study, there are still a few problems in this article.

1. The difference of ELP between the two groups should be mainly caused by different population and different IOL. The comparison maybe meaningless. I suggest the authors compare the two groups' difference value at different time points, which can reflect the evolution of ELP and the differences between the two groups.

2. The forms are too messy, the authors need to rewrite it.

3. Has the sample size been calculated to meet the needs of the study?

4. In the present manuscript, postoperative refractive outcomes remain stable across three months in two groups, ELP remains stable in Tecnis group, whereas it became larger at 1 month in 509M group. Then, the authors analyzed Correlations of the morphological features of capsulorrhexis and the ELP and refraction deviation. But, theoretically, the deviation from predicted refraction should be correlated to ELP changement. If any Capsulorrhexis Morphological Features parameter correlated to refraction deviation, it should affect refraction deviation by influencing ELP. So, the conclusion here is a little confused logically, please reanalyze and rewrite it.
5. In discussion, "Moving forward to the retina leads to a myopic deviation while moving backward to the retina leads to a hyperopic deviation. "moving forward to the retina, the retina should be cornea.

6. English and grammar are a problem and require upgrading.

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.

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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