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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting manuscript of importance in its field.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached):

• A short explanation of the reason for using both focus groups interviews and face-to-face interviews in the same study is necessary to understand the analyzing process and the results. What do this two methods complement each other to your findings?

• More information of the interview procedure is needed to be able to replicate the work. For example, how long time took each face-to-face interview and focus group interviews? How many participated in each focus group?

• In two of the face-to-face interviews you let two persons participate together. The reason for that is unclear. Are these two interview situations really comparable with an interview with a single person? I believe that the two respondents will affect each other in their answers. My suggestion is therefore to remove them from this interesting study. They just confuse the reader.

• Information about used interview guide is needed to understand the results. Did you use the same interview guide in both the focus group interviews as in the face-to-face interviews? How many and what type of questions were asked? Some of the question asked should be described in the text. E.g. the questionnaire could be presented in a table.

• Information of the persons conducting all the face-to-face interviews are needed and information’s of what skills and experience of interviewing do all the interviewers have? For example, you need different experiences in the two different qualitative methods.

• All presented quotes, in box 1 to 5, are from different focus group interview but not from any face-to-face-interview. Why? The question is therefore why do you need your face-to-face interviews in this paper, when you do not present them in to your results? A clarification of this is needed in your paper.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct):

• In page 7, “Obtaining data”: the authors describe that they used a tape-recorder in all the interviews. The authors need to clarify if this recorder was an audiotape recorder or a videotape recorder?
• In Page 17, Figure 1, it is written: “2 participants no longer interested when (?) “ When what? Is something missing in the text or …?

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore):

• I recommend the authors to remove some of the quotes presented in Box 1 to 5. Some of them do not bring any new information to the results. You only need one or two quotes to support your data. For example in Box 1: Quote number 2; 4 and 6, they are not necessary because they do not add any new information that quote number 1; 3 and 5 is saying, so they could be removed from the data. However this is only my recommendation to improve your paper.

• The authors own reflection about their results compared to other relevant studies is missing. It would have enriched the discussion section.

• The title is written as a question that has not been fully answered in this study/paper. My recommendation is therefore to rewrite the title and remove “Qualitative study” from the title. Suggestion of a title could be: “Tractable vision loss in older people, from their own point of view”. or: “Reasons of tractable vision loss in older people, from their own point of view”

• A methodological reference on focus groups technique would improve this paper

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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