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Reviewer's report:

Major Reviews:

- Even if there are 16 binocular implanted patients, You studied 14 patients (due to one macular edema and one death).

It would be more precise writing the right number of patients and eyes studied from the "Abstract" (not only in the Results).

- Strehl Ratio and MTF are not directly taken into consideration. They would be rather important data to be collected.

- You did not write the value of the Binocular UDVA.

- You did not specify how many manual curvilinear capsulorehxis and how many femtosecond laser-assisted capsulorehxis you performed.

- Can You please explain why did You choose a subjective examination such as a the haloes and glare simulator to verify the photic phenomena? Eyes implanted with multifocal IOLs could not give precise values of the photic phenomena perceived with a simulator. This kind of examination could be maybe worthy in order to compare IOLs, but is hard to interpret as an absolute value.

- Why did You not mention the study "Functional assessment of a new extended depth of focus intraocular lens" written by G. Savini, N. Balducci, C. Carbonara, S. Rossi, M. Alteri, N. Frugis, E. Zappulla, R. Bellucci, G. Alessio on 97 patients implanted with the same EDOF IOL?.

Minor Reviews:

-Pupillometry would be an interesting data to be recorded.
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.

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:
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