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**Reviewer's report:**

Page 2, line 1: I would add the word “laboratory” before the word “studies”.

Page 2, line 4: I would just say: BAK is the most commonly...

Page 2, line 7: I would substitute the word “employ” for “use”.

Page 3, line 4: This might better read…” activity of latanoprost with BAK exceeds that of travoprost with sofZIA…”

Page 4, paragraph 1: Might I suggest that the authors expand both here and in the discussion about the probably and potential problems associated with eye drop tip-eye and adenexa touch as demonstrated with { Stone JL, Robin AL, Novack GD, Covert DW, Cagle GD. An Objective Evaluation of Eye-Drop Instillation in Glaucoma Patients. Archives of Ophthalmology, 2009;127:732-736.} and with { Hennessy AL, Katz J, Covert D, Protzko C, Robin AL. Videotaped Evaluation of Eyedrop Instillation in Glaucoma Patients with Visual Impairment or Moderate to Severe Visual Field Loss. Ophthalmology. 2010 June 24 epub ahead of print}. These work clearly find that eye drop bottle contamination is a likely problem and that this could possibly be a much more important issue than previously believed.

Page 4, second paragraph: 5th line: The authors do NOT know why the sofZia system was developed. Might I suggest that the first part of the sentence be deleted. Instead, perhaps the authors might say: An alternative preservative system has been developed....” ALSO. Om the second to last line of this paragraph, Travatan Z has been developed by Alcon, not Allergan!!!

Page 5, line 4: both products are approved in both the US and Japan.

Page 6, lines 1-3: Why were these and not other fungi and bacteria included? The authors should clearly give an explanation within the text of the manuscript.

Page 7, lines 15-16: How did travoprost do against the other tested microorganisms? Also, in the discussion the authors should look at the relative frequency of these microorganisms causing trabeculectomy related blebitis and endophthalmitis to add a clinical perspective to this manuscript.

In the discussion, it might be worthwhile to state which pharmaceutical company
sponsored which study?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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