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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

- The title to figure 1 should read 2000-2003.
- Has the term 'indication creep' been used before? If so this should be referenced
In Table 2 and 3, the authors refer to 'local colleagues' and 'other ophthalmologists' as separate groups. This is a little confusing. Were the local colleagues non-ophthalmologists? Similarly, what is the distinction between other ophthalmologists and the Royal College of Ophthalmologists?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It is disappointing that the authors did not get as good a response to this survey as previously. However, they have acknowledged that this might lead to bias in the presented results. Have the authors considered a sub-analysis of the 76 units that responded to all 4 surveys?
It is pertinent that referral to the private sector has remained essentially unchanged across the 4 surveys and the authors may wish to address this in the discussion.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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