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Reviewer's report:

This is a fascinating case study into the vagaries of a clinical-political-economic quandary, in this case the transfer of the care of stable glaucoma patients.

Some of the issues will be specific to the Dutch model of care, and therefore lack general applicability, but enough of the issues as stumbling blocks to this transfer will be relevant to make the study more broadly relevant.

The article is in fact not well-served by the standard clinical paper format of Method-Results-Discussion, and one cannot help feeling that the paper was shoe-horned into this format to make its submission acceptable. A more free-form, discursive prose might be easier, and remove unnecessary repetition.

This is also true of the Quotation boxes under the 3 categories: whilst these satisfy our prurient interest, they could surely be more appropriately summarised and incorporated in the text.

The data such as they are, are small numbers of interviewees, and would in a normal paper constitute too small a sample, but here the insights provided are likely so stereotypical that the numbers are fine.

Among the routine and crucial findings that are mirrored in other studies (such as Azuro-Blanco et al) is the uncertainty on behalf of the consultant staff about the capabilities of the Optometrists to whom referral is being made, and the desire on the part of these optometrists for more specific training: this nexus is the keystone on which all such projects will succeed or fail, and this should probably be emphasised.

The 3 model approach is awkward in that there is no space to fully describe each model for unfamiliar readers and yet the insights available in each for the naive reader also make them worthwhile.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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