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Reviewer's report:

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

It would be interesting to pull into the discussion how treatments such as Lipator does and the range of an example such as Lipator to others in its class. The statistics of this work are very strong due mostly to the very high N. It would be interesting to know if other drugs and intra-class comparisons have similar findings. One paragraph with one or two references would be sufficient to compare this study with other drugs.

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

None

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

I would highly suggest this paper play down the differences between the treatments and focus on how poor the adherence/compliance/persistence is with all these treatments, where the consequence of non-compliance is irreversible blindness.

The strength of the interclass difference are clearly stated in the paper without addressing how different severities of glaucoma make use different treatments and may thus have different levels of compliance. The fact that one of the authors of the paper is an employee of the drug company makes this paper appear promotional by a pharmaceutical company for one treatment over the others. The peer-reviewer public issue is really how poor all compliance is with all these treatments.
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