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Reviewer's report:

The authors aim to present the quality and number of scientific publications from 5 different regions of the world from the year 2000 to 2011. Although the data is interesting, there are several limitations in the current draft. My specific comments are:

Major compulsory revisions

1. In the background section, the authors need to cite similar work in non-ophthalmology journals in order to stress the importance of the current study. Also, recent work in ophthalmology journals (Survey of systematic reviews and meta-analyses published in ophthalmology, British Journal of Ophthalmology, 2012) can be cited.

2. It may not be appropriate to categorize this manuscript as a retrospective study as mentioned in the methods section. The authors should consult the categories of manuscript again.

3. The authors should take note that the UK publications are in journals with offices in the UK. Similar trend is shown by the authors for Australia (Clinical Exp Ophthalmology), Japan (Japanese Journal of Ophthalmology) and China (Molecular Vision). This needs to be discussed in the discussion section of the manuscript.

4. The discussion is focused on the development on ophthalmic research and publications within China. However, the authors did not discuss the tremendous amount of publications that are published in Chinese language journals.

Minor essential revisions

5. Why was EMBASE not included during the search?

6. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses form a very important part of publications. Why did the authors choose to exclude this category?

7. If the number of publications from one region, say US, is higher then we expect the cumulative impact factor as well as the citations to be higher as well. Can the authors try and combine the data on these two parameters and therefore cut down one figure?

8. The region of origin of work was determined from the address of the first author. Shouldn’t it be acquired from the corresponding author’s address?
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