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Reviewer's report:

The authors made a hard work in recovering the published literature on drug discovery, however some major flaws can be addressed, because in general the manuscript is lacking of clarity and linearity.

- Specifically, the aim of the review is very poorly reported in the background section, where a generic sentence was reported, “In this review we consider this changing landscape in general and specifically in the context of ophthalmology”. A better specification of the objective would help the reader.

- Later in the results section, more informations on the objective of the paper are reported, lines 172-176. These informations, should be reported and detailed in the background section, and their reporting here make the line of the story very complicated and difficult to understand.

- As consequence, in example, it is difficult to evaluate what is included in the "past success" paragraph: why the authors included only informations on anti VEGF drug, and no more informations on other ocular drug discovery. An explanation about this "single" reporting, is needed.

- The authors reported that they will consider “...what these challenges are and discuss how they are being addressed in the industry as a whole and how this compares to the ocular drug discovery sector.” Mixing the problems of the ocular drugs discovery with that of the general industry, could make the reader quite confused on the content of the paper. Moreover, we found that the drug discovery problem in general is poorly addressed, and above all, poorly answered.

- To increase the linearity of the story, we suggest to make the review more focused on the ocular drug discovery problems, and to try a more detailed definitions of the scope, as well as a better definitions of the paragraph's content.
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