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Reviewer's report:

Re: Cataract Surgery combined with Excimer Laser Trabeculotomy to lower Intraocular Pressure: Effectiveness on different IOP Levels
To the Authors.

The Authors are to be congratulated on a well-designed and well-written paper.

This paper adds to the existing literature. This is the first study to measure the effect of this anti-glaucoma surgery in patients with an IOP less than 21 mmHg.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. Seven patients who underwent further procedures were omitted from the 1-year follow up. Are there any interim iop/ agd data for these patients? There omission from the final analysis means, that only patients with satisfactory IOP (with or without medication) are analysed, this is a huge omission and possible source of bias. While the reason they needed further procedures may not be due to failure of ELT. It is impossible to say from the data presented. I do that appreciate their inclusion in a table is relevant.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Using 2 eyes in the same patient presents certain statistical issues. Since the two eyes tend to be highly correlated, statistical methods to handle this Alternately, one eye of each subject could be utilized. I’m not which tests were used perhaps the authors could clarify?
2. Abstract. Methods. This is ambiguous, could actually be read to mean that assignation occurred 12 months after procedure or before it. Best to reorder sentence.
3. Abstract. Results. AGD not explained and no units given.
4. Main section. Methods. “….extracapsular cataract extraction by phacoemulsification and intracapsular lens implantation…” Extraction misspelled. Also the procedure described is phacoemulsification not extracapsular cataract extraction. I would remove extracapsular cataract extraction form the key words also.
5. Can the authors specify why they elected not to use intracameral antibiotic prophylaxis?

6. Conclusion. Include ocular hypertensive patients in the first sentence.

Discretionary Revisions
None

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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