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Reviewer 1
Comments to the Author
The major finding of this study was that the Chinese version of Catquest-8SF questionnaire correlated well with the improvement score and expectation of the surgery. Thus, the questionnaire could potentially be used as a routine clinical assessment tool. The conclusions were statistically supported and an adequate number of patients, 120, were assessed. Though the English and grammar need to be corrected prior to publication, the meaning of the sentences were clear. I have only a few minor comments.

1. Define all abbreviations such as SIOL, when they appear even though they are commonly used.
   **Response:** - We have defined the abbreviations as bellow: SIOL, single focus foldable intraocular lens; PVA, Presenting visual acuity; logMAR, logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution

2. Eliminate abbreviations such as CSR and PRO if they are not used more than a few times.
   **Response:** - We have eliminated the abbreviations as bellow: Cataract Surgical Rate, (CSR); patient-reported outcome, (PRO); optical coherence tomography, (OCT)

3. Figure 1. Define DR and ARMD in the figure caption and remove from the text.
   **Response:** - We have defined the abbreviations as bellow and removed from the text.
   Figure 1. Characteristics of the participants before surgery.
   DR: diabetic retinopathy, ARMD: age-related macular degeneration

4. Figure 2. Add axis labels and units.
   **Response:** - 0.000 on Y-axis show population mean, 0.200(-0.200) show 2 standard deviation. We consulted the professor Cheng Cong of statistics for question 4, 8 and 11, and with his help we made a better presentation. So as to table 7 and 8.

   For question 8, Tables 4 and 5. Is the value in parenthesis standard deviation. If so state this under the tables.
   **Response:** - The value in parenthesis is standard deviation, so we exchange that for ‘mead ±SD ’
   For question 11, Table 8. What is the unit of the statistics row?
   **Response:** - we reconfirmed the statistical methods and made more clear mark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>Edu.</th>
<th>Uncomfort</th>
<th>pre-op</th>
<th>Uncomfort</th>
<th>Post-op</th>
<th>Pain</th>
<th>during-op</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncomfort</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0758 # 0.058 # 0.235 # 0.167 # 0.542 # 0.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruskal-Wallis test; # Mann-Whitney test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Table 1. 2.28 ± 0.74 should be reported as 2.3 ± 0.7. the .08 and .04 are not significant with a deviation of 0.7. Apply this to all the values in Table 1.
**Response:** -We have revised the statistic as you suggested.

6. Tables 2 and 3. Define C1, C2… as you did in Table 1.

**Response:** -We have defined C1, C2… as you suggested.

7. Table 3. Add a ‘0’ in front of the values. .249 should be reported as 0.249.

**Response:** -We have added ‘0’ in front of the values as you suggested.

9. Table 6. (SD) define SD under the table.

**Response:** -We have defined the abbreviations under the table as bellow:

SD: standard deviation

10. Tables 5 and 6, you may want to exchange ‘cohort’ for ‘group’.

**Response:** -We have exchanged ‘cohort’ for ‘group’

monocular surgery cohort binocular surgery cohort

12. Table 9. Add a 0 in front of .296

**Response:** -We have added ‘0’ in front of .296

13. Discussion. The following was discussed in the Introduction and could be deleted as it is redundant: “The Catquest-9SF was translated into Chinese and re-translated back into English and cultural modification of the items [13]. The Chinese version of Catquest-8SF has been developed from the Catquest-9SF using Rasch analysis after clinical application [12] and that was the reason we chose it.”

**Response:** -We have deleted the redundant sentences.

14. Discussion. Delete the following as it is a result and not a discussion: The Catquest-9SF was translated into Chinese and re-translated back into English and cultural modification of the items [13]. The Chinese version of Catquest-8SF has been developed from the Catquest-9SF using Rasch analysis after clinical application [12] and that was the reason we chose it.

**Response:** -We have deleted the redundant sentences.

15. You don’t have to repeat the result values in the Discussion. It is sufficient to just state that the result was significantly improved. You don’t need P t and r values in the Discussion as they were already stated in the Results.

**Response:** -We have deleted the redundant sentences.

**Reviewer: 2**

Comments to the Author
The work shows a good adaptability to the Chinese population of the proposed evaluation test and therefore I consider your study very adherent to the intended purpose.
Response: Thank you for the positive comments.