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Response to Reviewers' comments

Dear editor,

We thank you for your careful consideration of our manuscript. We appreciate your response and overall positive feedback, and made modifications to improve the manuscript again. After carefully
reviewing the comments made by the Reviewers, we have modified the manuscript to improve the presentation of our results and their discussion, therefore providing a more complete context for the research that may be of interest to your readers.

We hope that you will find the revised paper suitable for publication, and we look forward to contributing to your journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us with other questions or concerns regarding the manuscript.

Best regards,

1. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

"Comparative outcomes of femtosecond laser-assisted cataract surgery and manual phacoemulsification: a six-month follow-up"

"Femtosecond cataract surgery: transitioning to laser cataract"

"Evaluation of dry eye after femtosecond laser–assisted cataract surgery"

This overlap mainly exists in the Methods sections. While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. We would therefore be grateful if you could reformulate in your own words the overlap between your manuscript and other sources.
Response: Thanks for the comment. We proofread the manuscript and tried to replace the overlapped words with our own words (Methods section, line 101-112, page 5; Methods section, line 191-192, page 8). If you find the missing overlap that we did not reformulate, please tell us.

2. Please confirm whether the consent was written or verbal, in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section.
Response: Thanks for the comment. This was clarified in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section (line 347, page 14).

3. Please note the Availability of data statement should detail the location of any RAW data underlying the conclusions made in this study. We note that only summarized data is presented in this manuscript, so we would like to ask that you amend this statement. Please note that we strongly encourage authors to share their data in a publicly available repository as this increases the visibility of your data/study. If you do not wish to share your data (whether in a repository, supplementary files, or within the manuscript), please state this along with the reason.
Response: Thanks for the comment. The RAW data belongs to the 19 cataract surgery clinics involved in the research. Several surgery clinics don't want to share their data in a publicly available repository
at this moment as it is related to the patients' privacy. Thanks for your understanding. If you still prefer to make the RAW data public, that would be great if you can give me 2 additional weeks so that I would have the opportunity to discuss further with all the surgery clinics and try my best to get their approvals to share their data.

4. In the funding section, please also state the role of the funding body in the design of the study, collection, analysis, interpretation of data, and in writing the manuscript.
Response: Thanks for the comment. This study was not funded by any agency. Therefore, we did not state the responsibility of funding body.

5. Please proofread your manuscript and ensure that when you upload your revised submission that it is in the final form for publication. Please remove any tracked changes, colored text, or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.
Response: Thanks for the comment. The manuscript was proofread and a clean version was uploaded.