

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade D (Fair)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** May detail out Methodology. To include number of articles/ researches reviewed and what are the inferences of such articles reviewed. May include causes under discussion section.

Response:

Thank you for the advice, we have revised it.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade A (Excellent)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (High priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Excellent review of the literature in an easily written review showing important findings: In the univariate analysis of IOL tilt, the IOL tilt is significantly associated with a shorter axial length (AL) – the IOL tilt decreases by  $0.228^{\circ}$  for every 1 mm increase in AL. Furthermore, a greater IOL decentration is correlated with a longer AL Zonular instability has been proven to be an essential factor affecting surgical procedure and IOL stability a capsular tension ring (CTR) could prevent IOL dislocation from zonular weakness, reducing the risk of marked anterior capsule contraction aspherical IOLs are more sensitive to decentration or tilt than spherical IOLs. The tilt and decentration of aspheric IOLs markedly increase the wavefront aberration and have remarkable effects on visual quality. The tilt and decentration of the toric IOL increase the HOAs and decrease the visual quality Toric-EDOF IOL has high rotational stability and concentration, helping patients to achieve better distant, intermediate, and near vision with reduced astigmatism.

Response:

Thank you for the advice!

Reviewer #3:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Please see the attached Word File for specific comments to the authors.

**Title**

**Comment 1:** Authors might need to refer to the title of the study as a “*narrative review*” or simply “*a review*” instead of “*an update of recent advances*.” The authors did not include any article published in 2021 despite having been several reporting important recent advances. See, PubMed Search Strategy: **((intraocular lens[Title/Abstract]) AND (tilt[Title/Abstract])) AND (decentration[Title/Abstract])** . This raises questions on “*how recent*” did the authors mean?

**Declarations**

**Comment 2: Consent to Publish (Ethics):** Authors might be confusing “*consent to publishing individual’s personal information*” and “*authors’ approval to submission of the manuscript to the journal.*” In the present review, where no human subjects/participants were involved nor personal identifying information was used, the consent to publish is “***not applicable.***” Did the authors wish to say, “*all authors approved the submission of the manuscript to the journal,*” instead?

Response:

Thank you for the advices, we have revised them.

***(1) Science editor:***

This manuscript reviews the contemporary literature on the tilt and decentration of various types of intraocular lenses (IOLs), explore the effects of IOL tilt and decentration on visual quality indicators, and studied difference between IOL tilt and decentration. Is it possible to include articles published in 2021? Please add more information in the Methodology section.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

***(2) Company editor-in-chief:***

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript.

Response:

Thank you for the advices, we have revised them.

But I'm really sorry. Do we need to add figures or tables? Since this is a literature review, I do not have tables or figures, I’m wondering may I not adding them?

I am sorry for asking that.