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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is of some interest even if some points need to be amended.

Intro
page 3 line 18 please cite a recent a review of our group: Quaranta et 24-hour intraocular pressure and ocular perfusion pressure in glaucoma. Surv Ophthalmol. 2013 Jan-Feb;58(1):26-41.

Methods
Control and POAG should be better defined as regards refraction, CCT, VF indexes, smoking habit, caffeine assumption. Moreover blood pressure and blood pressure medications should be also reported. POAG patients should be matched for age, extent of VF damage, and length of the disease, and if possible for medical therapy.

PAGE 4 LINE 46 Sub-groups selection: you state that as a selection criteria for defining PVD DVA should be normal. 1) What do you mean for normality of DVA. (I know that Prof. Flammer has extensively published on it, so please give a more comprehensive description). 2) If you select patients on the basis of DVA normality you have introduced a strong bias of pre-selection that should strongly interphere with results.

Table 2 is of limited interest if no level of significance is mentioned. If no difference between the two eyes was detected you should consider to mention it in the results section.

Discussion
There is a large body of evidence on blood flow abnormalities in glaucoma (thanks to Prof. Flammer!!), but the results of the present study are really very limited, I suggest Dr Maneli Mozaffarieh to understate conclusions. based on the present results.
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