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Reviewer’s report:

The majority of the comments have been addressed. Some areas still require clarification. My main comments are:

1. In the results-section, the reader is referred to figures, some of which are not easily interpreted, due to the large number of symbols used per plot (first three Bland-Altman plots- ideally, these three figures should be simplified).

2. It may be useful to add simple statements as to whether or not the measurements were repeatable, reproducible and whether or not there was agreement between the instruments.

3. A segmentation of CCT, ECD and CV data would be useful. I have commented on this previously, but still feel that it may be hard for the casual reader to grasp the essence of the study.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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