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Reviewer's report:

Some of the faults previously reported have been addressed in this reviewed version. There are still many flaws in the written english (line 135 i suppose it is Ethic and not ethnic - line 245 and many following lines "correction" should be "correlation" - line 288: "in the precious study" should be "in previous studies" - line 302 "the angle alpha is th center of the capsule" must be clarified - line 305-308 the sentence is not clearly understandable and should be clarified - line 305 " HOA and SE" is it really Spherical equivalent? in the data there is no mention of correlation of angle alpha with spherical equivalent post operatively. Line 311 is SA an HOA ? - Line 328-320 what is the meaning of "conflicting predictability"? And what is the role of astigmatism, in the data set it is impossible to find a measure of astigmatism. Lines 338-341: the english is quite bad and the sense is not clear.

Last issue is the sense and the relevance of predictive value of post-operative parameters (TR SE and aberrations): it's logical to assess the correlation between different parameters and visual function, it's of course important to have preoperative predictive factors, that may modify the patient's selection, but what is the sense of predicting something you cannot modify, as the surgery has already been performed?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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