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Reviewer's report:

The question object of this paper is well posed and clearly defined. The methods are well described and appropriate to simulate the "real life" use of the drug.

The data gathered seem to be sound and there are not any intrinsic contradiction.

The format of the paper is standard and adherent to common use in scientific communication. Statistical analysis seems adequate and well described.

2 issues have to be addressed in data presentation and discussion:

1) Authors used a five point grading scale but results of this grading are only reported in table 1 and not exposed nor discussed, while they prefer to focus only on the collapsed grouping in two categories. So we lose some important information: if we look at table 1 there is a widespread shift towards higher degrees of hyperemia that is not evident if we look only at fig. 2 where only 12.3 and 12.7% of patients worsened. If we had a similar graph with the 5 point scale the shift towards hyperemia would be much more evident.

Moreover we don't know whether the general trend is due to few cases with significant worsening or in a generalized shift with some patients crossing the line between grade +1 and +2.

2) the second important issue is the high attrition rate: 25% in only 12 weeks is more than expected even if Authors correctly comment on it and state that it may be due to poor tolerance and/or side effects and therefore associated with a higher rate of side effects and drug discontinuation. The issue is not obscured but remains a limit of the study and perhaps a telephonic inquiry about causes of missing follow-up visit would have been useful.

The title is correctly informative, but abstract only refers to the collapsed data and perhaps some hint to more diffuse increase in hyperemia although not severe would be more correct.

The overall judgement is that the paper should be published after some minor but important corrections.
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