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**Reviewer's report:**

**General comment:**
The authors have used appropriate statistical methods.

**Major comment:**
1. Page 7-8:
   You excluded the 5.8% (72/1241) patient who had an eye operation on their best seeing eye during follow-up. It seems realistic that many, maybe most, of these would have developed impaired visual acuity had they not been operated. In a sense this implies that you underestimate the cumulative incidence of visual impairment. Please comment on this and the possibly induced bias. Perhaps it is interesting to carry out a secondary analysis (sensitivity analysis) considering these, or some of these, to have impaired vision?

**Minor comments:**
2. Page 7 line 6 from bottom:
The terms “multivariate analysis” and “multivariable analysis” are sometimes incorrectly used interchangeably. In the strict sense, multivariate analysis refers to simultaneously predicting multiple outcomes. I suggest you use the more general term multivariable analysis.

3. Page 8 line 10:
Did you really use Kruskall-Wallis and chi squared tests? If not, delete (part of) this sentence.

4. Page 8 line 11:
Significance level 0.001 would correspond to a Bonferroni correction if there were 50 =0.05/0.001 tests, which you do not have! This is unnecessarily conservative. I suggest you use a less conservative level, such as 0.005 or 0.01.
Please include the number of cases, like in the preceding sentences.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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