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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript "Tracing the natural course of visual acuity and quality of life in neovascular age-related macular degeneration: a systematic review and quality of life study" addresses an interesting and important topic. In summary, the manuscript is well written. I have only some minor commentaries and recommendations.

1. In the method section, the authors frequently write that specific information has been published previously. I accept that it is not necessary to report all information comprehensively a second time. However, especially in case of the Monte Carlo Simulation and the QOL study further Information would be very helpful. The authors should be more precise.

2. How many authors took part in the literature selection process? The authors should say who they are?

3. Page 5, line 28: "Articles failing the exclusion criteria were excluded". Do the authors really want to say that? What do they mean?

4. The authors write that in "cost-effectiveness anaylsis, it is standard practice to compare a proposed treatment with a non-treatment alternative. I am not familiar with the Dutch Guidelines for conducting of cost-effectiveness analysis, but I am pretty sure that this Statement is not generalizable. As a health economist, I have never performed a comparison to non-Treatment, always against an active comparator, usually treatment as usual, which is still a treatment. The only situation in which a comparison could be appropriate is a study to compare a prevention strategy versus a non-prevention strategy. The authors should be more cautious with their assumption.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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