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Reviewer's report:

- Authors mentioned in the definition criteria of NTG that IOP is less than or equal to 21 mmHg, but the range of preoperative IOP was reported 12-24 mmHg.

- 73 eyes had PVC and 28 eyes had VC of which 19 eyes had previous cataract surgery. So only 9 eyes were phakic. No significant statistical data could be obtained from this small number of eyes when compared to the 92 phakic eyes. Also, based on this, the data mentioned in lines 164 - 169 (Results) should be corrected.

Methods:

- It was more logic to have two groups one including CV and the other PVC.

- Line 98: "LGP was performed if progression was noticed on visual fields". Did the eyes with no LGP stop deterioration on visual fields throughout the follow up duration?

Results:

- Complete success was achieved in 29% and qualified success in 44%. Nothing was mentioned about 27% of eyes which was reported as failure.

- Line 143: There were 10 patients (13%) lost to follow-up by 12 months. These numbers differ from those mentioned in Table (1). Also 10 patients or 11 eyes do not equal (13%).

- Lines 164-169: The values should be corrected, i.e. 92 aphakic eyes Vs. 9 phakic eyes.
Discussion:

- Line 234: Correct PC/VC to PVC/ VC.

- Line 254: prospective to retrospective.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal