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**Reviewer's report:**

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? **YES**
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? **FOR THE MOST PART**
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? **YES**
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? **YES**
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? **FOR THE MOST PART**
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? **YES**
7. Is the writing acceptable? **YES**

**Reviewer's report**

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

**- Major Compulsory Revisions**

This is a good paper and I'm glad to see more work being done in this area. However, I don't feel that the subjective assessment of stereopsis achieved with each modality can be published as "research." It would be impossible to remove observer bias when evaluating each modality, and as such the subjective differences noted cannot be accurately attributed to the stereoscopic capability of each device; there are simply too many confounders to make an accurate conclusion. However, if that part were removed, the remainder of the paper, in which the correlation of LCD goggles to the autostereoscopic display was assessed, is worthy of publication.

**- Minor Essential Revisions**

There are a few of these: a period out of position on page 5, spacing errors (pg 5 etc.) and a few spelling errors (eg "steteoscopic" on page 9).

**- Discretionary Revisions**
I liked the explanation of the technologies but felt this could be simplified a little. It gets a little too technical and this might turn off readers who have limited technical expertise (ie older ophthalmologists).

What next?
---------

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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.

Declaration of competing interests
----------------------------------

When completing your declaration, please consider the following questions:

- Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper, either now or in the future?

No

- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper, either now or in the future?

I am a shareholder in Secure Diagnostic Imaging, but publication of this result will not affect that company or my teleophthalmology interests. In fact, I should say that publication would enhance my ability, as well as SDIâ##s, to operate.
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