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**Reviewer’s report:**

The manuscript is succinct and well written, and I congratulate the authors.

I have some suggestions/questions for the authors:

1. **Methods:**
   a. Why were subjects selected whose IOPs varied between 22 to 29mmHg? Was this to increase the IOP range over which the comparisons could be made?
   b. I would suggest stating how many measurements were taken of CCT and whether the value used was an average of a number of readings.

2. **Results:**
   Why did you include 45 subjects whose ethnicity was not Caucasian? You had a large number of Caucasian subjects, so why not just present their results. Could the 45 subjects with non-Caucasian ethnicity have affected your findings substantially?

3. **Figures:**
   I understand why you included Figure 1, but I wonder if it really tells us anything that the rest of the paper doesn’t? I am inclined to suggest removal of this Figure, but do not feel strongly re this.

4. **Discussion:**
   I think this is excellent.

5. **References:**
   It seems as if reference 7 is incomplete as it does not include the page numbers for the cited paper.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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