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Reviewer's report:

General
This is an interesting article that gives a nice overview of the Ophthalmology litigation in England.

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

1. The conclusion in the ABSTRACT is not justified by the study as its aim was not a comparison of opthalmic litigation in England and USA. Therefore, the authors should rewrite the conclusions in a way to be confined with the aim and the results of this study. Please also note that the conclusion in the text, which is different form that in the ABSTRACT, is more consistent to the aim and the results.

2. In the RESULTS the authors in addition to the tables should sahortly present the main points that these tables present instead of giving just a longer legend.

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

1. The last sentence of the first paragraph in the BACKGROUND "Very little......subspecialties" is not clear and needs clarification.

2. The text needs a spelling review.

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: Needs some language corrections before being
published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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