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Reviewer's report:

Health care providers face a major challenge to monitor patients with glaucoma, thus this paper addresses an important topic. The authors must be congratulated for designing a RCT in this under-researched area.

I’d bring to the authors’ attention the following issues:

Abstract.
- Add duration of the study (duration of follow-up and length of modelling exercise)
- Add that IOP was the only clinical outcome considered
- Cost savings are modest (about 10%). This should be reflected in the Abstract.

Methods section

Inclusion criteria
- How many patients had stable glaucoma and risk for glaucoma? These are very different groups and it will help to describe the population
- How was the target pressure selected for glaucoma patients? The authors only describe TP for subjects at risk
- Can the authors describe the protocol (e.g. did patients have VF, HRT and GDx every visit, or depending on their glaucoma severity they’d have some but not all tests?; did the technicians use Goldmann tonometry?

Page 7: the authors mentioned that there were 3 different types of personnel within the GFU. It is unclear what is the 3rd group other than optometrists and ophthalmic technicians.

Discussion

Would the authors consider modelling the ability of GFU to detect conversion or progression of glaucoma and the additional cost associated with missing progression? Certainly GFU would not perform as well as glaucoma specialists. How many patients would they need to miss for the shared care scheme not to be cost-effective?

Would the author consider estimating the CEA of not using imaging at all, i.e., only following patients with VFs? And also the scenario of using only IOP (as this is the only clinical outcome measured)?
Page 18. The reference for estimating progression of glaucoma needs to be updated (work by Heijl, Quigley...)
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