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Reviewer's report:

The authors seek to compare intraocular pressure measurements among three different non-contact tonometers and goldman tonometry in healthy subjects.

In principle, this is a well-written paper and the authors are addressing an important issue. However, I have some concerns that need to be addressed.

Specific comments:

The authors did not randomize the sequence of the measurements within the three non-contact tonometers. How can the authors be sure that this does not affect the outcome? This needs to be addressed in the discussion.

The study did not include subjects with irregular astigmatism or astigmatism more than 3.5 diopters. Although this is reasonable for the current study, this issue needs to be discussed. In particular, it means that the findings of the current study hold only true for the selected group of subjects.

Did the authors perform a power and sample size calculation prior to study start? What was the power of the study to detect differences between groups in the selected sample size? This is especially important for the sub-group analysis. Do the authors need to correct for multiple testing?

Although it is briefly mentioned in the discussion, I feel that the limitations of the study should be discussed in more detail. In particular, the fact that no patients with high IOPs have been included is of importance also in respect to the conclusion of the study. Furthermore, the CCT correction and the possible impact on the study results need to be discussed in more detail.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

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

Unable to assess

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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