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Reviewer's report:

No revisions required.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes. The authors developed a quantitative method for analyzing localized RNFL defects with RNFL photography. The method might improve diagnosis and monitoring of glaucoma in high myopic eye.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods used are appropriate. Exclusion criteria for patients involved in the study were well defined. The study was well planned and executed. The evaluation of RNFL was partially blinded.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. Statistical methods were used properly. The results are discussed in a clear and explanatory way.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Manuscript is in line with the reporting and data management standards. Paper includes conflict of interest.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes. The discussion is sound and clear. It is well supported by the data obtained during the study.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   The authors indicate some limitations of the study. Because of the retrospective nature of the study the bias can’t be excluded. Angle was not adjusted for axial length and refractive error. The results might be affected by diffuse atrophy in high myopic eyes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Citations are well selected and clearly acknowledge previous developments in related areas of research.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes. No comments.
9. Is the writing acceptable? The paper is easily readable. Writing acceptable.

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
'I declare that I have no competing interests’