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Reviewer's report:

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

This well written article tackles a clinically important area - how best to detect visual field loss in patients on treatment with vigabatrin. The problem is well defined, as are the shortcomings of the existing literature. The paper is a significant advance on existing studies, which tend to be retrospective and cross sectional. The paper provides a good way for analyzing kinetic perimetry results.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The study is prospective and well designed by a multidisciplinary research group. Semiautomated kinetic perimetry with correction for reaction time is used to follow up of patients who have been started on vigabatrin. There is two year follow up with 5 examinations during the study period and most importantly a pre treatment baseline examination. The inclusion criteria were quite rigorous and clearly defined.

Are the data sound?

Yes. 29 epilepsy patients were included but 15 had to excluded for a number of reasons. This data is honestly presented and chimes with clinical experience of these patients. It would be hard to get better data form this group of patients. A strength of this study is the length of follow up.

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes. The data and its inevitable shortcomings is honestly presented.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes

Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Yes
Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes there is a good account of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing literature

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes

Is the writing acceptable?

Yes the paper is clearly and succinctly written

**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.
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