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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author,

in my opinion your subgroup analysis of a well documented, large randomized study is a valid and worthwhile approach. However, I would recommend a few clarifications and some shortening of the manuscript text. Specifically, I would like to address the following issues:

Abstract

line 47-51 (abstract): when reading the abstract, it is confusing that the ICMA group is said to consist of 24/57 patients, followed by the statement that 24(96%) patients had successful capsulorhexis, when you actually refer to 24/25 patients. This is later explained by the differences between ITT and mITT set in lines 178ff. and the switch of one patient from topical to ICMA, but I suggest rephrasing this part of the abstract to avoid this confusion.

line 51: No diabetic patient (singular)

Results:

line 178ff: you are explaining the different patient sets (ITT, mITT, mITT-An), but from the results you mention in the text, it is not always clear which of the different sets you refer to, unless the reader recalculates the percentage values. As an example, line 216 states that 19(82.6%) of the ICMA group had no sign. change in pupil size. 82.6% means that you refer to 19/23 patients, which is the mITT-An subset. In this example it is also not clear why the reference is not the mITT set with 24 patients. I suggest reporting the results in a different format, for example 82.6% (19/23, mITT-An group).
Discussion:

I would suggest shortening of the discussion somewhat. Just giving one example, the first sentence in line 313 could be omitted. Furthermore, I advise caution in the way you present the advantages of ICMA in the discussion. From a more neutral perspective, this subgroup analysis shows that ICMA works as well for diabetes patients as for the original study group and does not seem inferior to a topical protocol. Limiting the discussion to a few explanations and careful conclusions is especially advisable in a setting where the study is exclusively focused on a single commercial product.

Best regards
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