**Response to Reviewer Comments.** We thank the reviewers for the constructive criticism and have made the required minor modifications to the manuscript accordingly, with changes in underlined red text.

**Responses to Reviewer 1 Comments.**

*[KC1]: Use another word instead of “significant”.*

* I have replaced this word with “substantial”.

(Introduction, line 4) Contact lens-induced Dry Eye Syndrome causes substantial discomfort and affects the quality of life of millions worldwide.

*[KC2]: What statistics were used to test if friction coefficients were different? At what level?*

* An additional statement regarding the statistical test has been included in the Methods section.

(Methods, line 17) “Statistics were analyzed using a two-way ANOVA test with lenses as one variable and sliding velocities as the other.”

*[KC3]: Generally, if things are different it implies that they are different by a significance test.*

* I have eliminated the word “significantly”.

*[KC4]: How does this affect the big picture? For example, should I not buy PRG4 rich contact solution because there don’t seem to be differences?*

* As stated in the discussion, “PRG4 had no apparent friction-reducing effect in ATS. This may be due to PRG4 binding to lipids in ATS and not being able to adhere to the lens. Future experiments are required to understand the dependence of PRG4’s friction-reducing effects on hydrophobic moieties, either in contact lenses or in tears.” As such, additional experiments are required, and beyond the scope of this initial study, before any ‘big picture’ statements can be made.

**Response to Reviewer 3 Comment**

*The abstract had the supervisor's comments and it was a little confusing.*

* I apologize for not clearing the tracked changes before submitting the abstract.