Comment 1: In the Abstract, the authors state that IRDs are a “variable collection of devastating disorders that lead to irreversible blindness”. Although this is true for many IRDs, it is not for some. Therefore revision is suggested.
Response 1: Thank you for this comment. We have revised “irreversible blindness” to “significant visual impairment”.

Comment 2: On page 3, line 37, the authors refer to “toxicity immunogenicity”. Which one?
Response 2: Thank you for this comment. The manuscript only states toxicity now.

Comment 3: On page 4, line 72, need to revise sentence to indicate the reason FST is desirable. What do the authors mean by “favorable”?
Response 3: Thank you for this comment. We have changed the word favorable to useful to indicate how FST is useful relative to other outcome measurements in patients with poor fixation.

Comment 4: “Voretigene neparvovec” should be substituted for “Luxturna”.
Response 4: The manuscript has been adjusted to reflect this change.

Comment 5: On page 5, line 92, the authors refer to a meta-analysis that mixes gene therapy agents of differing constructs (i.e. promoters, enhancing sequences) and formulation although containing the same gene sequence. The requirements for meta-analysis is that date from each study included should be is similarly collected and representative. Suggest revising to indicate the controversial nature of this data or study.
Response 5: Thank you, we agree with this comment and have revised our description of their study.

Comment 6: On page 7, line 125, “greater” should be substituted for “grater”.
Response 6: The manuscript has been adjusted to reflect this change.

Comment 7: On page 7, line 126, do the authors mean “supported by preclinical data” rather than “in conjuction”?
Response 7: Yes, thank you for this comment. The manuscript has been adjusted
to reflect this change.

**Comment 8:** On page 7, line 132, who is highly anticipating? Why?
**Response 8:** Thank you for this comment. We removed the phrase “highly anticipating” from the manuscript.

**Comment 9:** On page 9, line 176, need reference for “Dimopoulos, et al.”
**Response 9:** Reference has been added.

**Comment 10:** On page 10, line 200, need citation for study.
**Response 10:** Citation has been added.

**Comment 11:** On page 13, line 268, again who or why are results “eagerly awaited”?
**Response 11:** Thank you for this comment. We have removed the phrase “eagerly awaited” to avoid confusion.

**Comment 12:** On page 14, line 288, needs citation.
**Response 12:** Citation has been added.

**Comment 13:** On page 15, lines 305 & 312, revise sentences to begin with a word not a number.
**Response 13:** These sentences have been revised and now begin with a word instead of a number.

**Comment 14:** On page 16, line 324, suggest revising as this is very awkward sentence.
**Response 14:** Thank you, we have revised the sentence to “Similarly to Yuan et al., they observed timing of treatment to affect function as more substantial visual recovery occurred in patients that had visual loss commence for less than 1 year before treatment”

**Comment 15:** On page 17, line 347 suggest revising as all XLR don’t have electronegative ERGs.
**Response 15:** Thank you for this comment. We have removed reference to electronegative ERGs to avoid confusion.

**Comment 16:** Second paragraph of Conclusion should be revised as the thesis
sentence is confusing. Do the authors mean that the durability of gene therapy is not fully established?

**Response 16:** Thank you for this comment. Yes, we wanted to state that the durability of gene therapy has not been established. The sentence has been revised.

**Comment 17:** The references need particular attention paid to the journal abbreviations and capitalization. Even among the journal names, the authors have varied abbreviations and capitalization. Suggest revising to the Vancouver standard or whatever ATM considers its journalistic standard.

**Response 17:** Thank you. We have revised references to be consistent with the Vancouver reference style.