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**Reviewer's report:**

Major compulsory revisions

I am not a health economist and therefore I am not in a position to comment on the details of the economic evaluation. In general the reporting of the study needs to be improved. Reference 7 is cited as the main trial report but the reference is not in sufficient detail to find the report. This reference is crucial to the interpretation of this study. If this main trial report is accessible then it is acceptable that this manuscript is then reported as an economic evaluation alongside the trial; the main trial design and findings would be reported in brief with reference to the main trial report. If the main trial report is not in the public domain then this manuscript needs to be reported according to the CONSORT guidelines. I would suggest that the updated guidelines (BMJ 2010) are used.

Minor essential revisions

Methods:

Was a sample size calculation undertaken prior to the study start? Details are required of the power of the study.

More details of the randomisation method are required in terms of allocation method and concealment.

The authors should clarify for the GFU group as to who conducted the monitoring.

What was the primary outcome and when was it measured? This needs to be described for both groups. It appears to be quality of care with various components how were these measured and how was a composite quality of care outcome defined?

Inclusion criteria: Criteria 5 states that vision had to be #20/100 and or patient had no visual field loss does this mean only those without glaucoma were included? This needs to be clarified. If this is the case it needs to a limitation in the discussion in that this follow up service relates to those at risk of glaucoma and not those with stable glaucoma.

Results: Details of the patient flow are required in a CONSORT diagram, if not published elsewhere, for easy reference.

The writing style is rather conversational and I feel would benefit from editing and deleting unnecessary words, for example results section page 11 ‘quality of care
turned out to be similar for two groups’. There are many similar examples throughout the manuscript.

**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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