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Reviewer’s report:

General

The shape of the truncated quadrants tested caused me some concern. While the superior and inferior regions tested are satisfactory, those tested nasally and temporally do not accord with clinical experience of the pattern and position of glaucomatous damage.

Optic nerve head damage from glaucoma tends to separate superior and inferior regions in onset and pace of destruction. To set a test pattern so that it overlaps the horizontal meridian confounds the results dramatically.

Have the authors looked at the sensitivity / specificity of their data from the superior and inferior truncated quadrants on the one hand, versus the nasal and temporal truncated quadrants on the other? It would not surprise me to see a significant difference between these results, with the superior and inferior quadrants providing much closer correlation with standard automated visual field loss locations than the temporal and nasal tested regions.

-----------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

See above. For any clinician reading this paper, this doubt must be clarified one way or the other.

-----------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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