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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We thank again the reviewer for her help to improve our manuscript. Please find our changes here below.

Heidemarie Haller, MSc. (Reviewer 1): Again, I would like to thank the authors for the revision of their manuscript. I am fine with most of the changes, but would suggest adding information of the 10th patient, who was lost before randomization, to the results and the flow chart.

answer : the 10th patient was added to the flow-chart, abstract and results.

Moreover, the authors should restructure the secondary outcome section (page 7 and 8) and should describe only the outcomes as secondary, which were planned as secondary outcomes.

answer : pain, lacrimation and sensations were mentioned as "others endpoints"

Pain, lacrimation, and sensations should be described below a distinct subheading (safety outcomes or process outcomes or something like that). According to this, the abstract and the results should be restructures as well.

answer : this was done.