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Reviewer's report:

The present paper is a prospective large scale study following a group of newly diagnoses diabetic subjects, including their visual acuity and several ocular manifestations in the study period. The study gives a broader understanding of visual impairment in elder diabetic subjects and is worth publishing. However a number of points given below should be considered and discussed.

1.

In Denmark glaucoma is one of the most frequently occurring causes to visual impairment and blindness. It is still under debate if glaucoma is more frequently occurring in diabetic subjects than in non diabetic subjects. It is a weakness that the study gives no indications of the frequency of glaucoma in the study population. Would it be possible to give some information about glaucoma in the study group, ie. glaucoma medication? This would strengthen the study.

2.

It is well documented that ophthalmologists can assess retinal disorders with some variability. Studies comprising many ophthalmologists therefore benefit from a pre-study certification of the examining eye doctors. Alternatively a reading center for assessing retinal protographic recordings are beneficial. Was there any thoughts about the quality of the gives ophthalmic examinations?

3.

The statistics comprised the best seeing eye. Since ocular pathology often varies in the two eyes this setup gives a possible underestimation of the ocular pathologies. I would have preferred a setup selection all right eyes or alternatively a randomization procedure. What was the argument for the present setup?

I suggest the others consider the above given point. I still find the paper worth publishing since such large scale studies are very difficult to perform and time consuming.
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