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Reviewer’s report:

General

The aim of this retrospective study was to assess the impact of knowing the CCT on management of ocular hypertension and glaucoma. Evidence that knowledge of CCT changes the management of glaucoma will support the routine use of pachymetry in glaucoma clinics. Although knowledge of CCT appeared to have an effect on glaucoma management the impact on the long term outcome can not be concluded from this study. There is no control group and therefore intra-observer bias could have affected the results.

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

1 in the methods section the authors did not mention whether patients with corneal disease or previous corneal refractive surgery were excluded from the study.

2 the method of adjusting the IOP should be clarified giving the correction factor and the reference CCT used.

3 the amount of IOP adjustment used in the study is not given clearly. A frequency diagram of the distribution of adjusted IOP could be added.

4 In the results section the study population is not described in terms of age, sex and race.

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

In Table 1 the total number should be 55 and not 65 and the number 44 should be 34 on column heading (under-treatment group).

In the line 11 of the second paragraph of the methods section the word pachmate should be pachemeter.

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 whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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