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Reviewer's report:

The authors have covered the queries and it looks a very good paper.

I think there are a few things that need to be amended though:

- They have not corrected "asses" in the conclusion of their abstract.
- A sentence starting at the bottom of page 3 and finishing at the top of page 4 (in the section beginning "Evaluation of Driving Habits") - I'd suggest they write "with additional questions from other questionnaires in the Salisbury Eye Evaluation" instead of what they currently have.
- Though I am happy authors rounded the %s to whole numbers in Table 2, they should probably mention that they have done so somewhere in the table heading or below the table.
- Lastly, I'm not convinced entirely by the authors handling of one of the two requested additional sections in the discussion. In describing other ways that driving performance were assessed they briefly discussed the advantages and disadvantages of their approach over "Other studies [that]... used simulators and direct on-road evaluation to assess the impact of glaucoma on driving", which I was satisfied with.

I think this section in the discussion requires revision.

"Finally, while binocular VF loss may seem to be more relevant to function, it is not easily calculated in clinic and previous data has shown that it does not predict different outcomes with regards to driving cessation (Arora, under submission, 2012) or fitness to drive [29] than better-eye VF MD.

Therefore, better-eye VF MD (easily calculated from a pair of VF printouts) was instead chosen to express disease severity."

I am unaware of the Arora et al paper and I don’t think it should be cited unless it has been published? But perhaps that is a question for the editor? Also I’m not sure [29] has been discussed correctly here? At the very least, for [29] it should say "with regards to driving cessation or legal fitness to drive in the UK" instead of implying that BEMD was actually tested against fitness to drive. Furthermore, I think this paragraph should ideally be mentioning methods of binocular VF measures and discussing their merits and flaws a bit more in relation to fitness to drive. For instance, it is worth mentioning that (certainly in patients with advanced VF defects) it has already been shown twice (Nelson-Quigg 2001 and Asoaka..."
2011) that using the BEMD yields overly pessimistic estimates for the binocular VF as a limitation of the study. I’d like to see these references added.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.