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Reviewer’s report:

This is a clearly written paper with sound methodology that highlights the inconsistencies between community screening program and hospital based assessment.

Minor essential revisions

Methods
- There was no written consent taken for patients # were no, or consent was not
- Patients attending diabetic eye screening service are subjects to continuous audits to ensure data quality. # are subjected to? Or are subjects of

Discretionary revisions

Results
- What were the visual acuities of the 18 live patients who were found to have better than NPL vision?
- Brief description of variability of the visual function observed in the 14 audit subjects observed would preferred
- 27 subjects out of 78 (35%) that were found to have certifiable vision on DRSS turned out to have non-certifiable vision. What were the reasons for this?

Discussion
- With the obvious variability of visual function seen in the 14 patients, can the authors propose solutions to improve the certification process to ensure that the visual acuity certified is at least the best minimum vision at point of examination?
- 27 subjects out of 78 (35%) that were found to have certifiable vision on DRSS turned out to have non-certifiable vision. Can the authors highlight the reasons for non-agreement in this group?
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