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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The authors address an interesting question of if there is any structural changes in the remaining eye following enucleation for retinoblastoma. They included 60 patients. 15 unilateral cases enucleated, 15 unilateral cases treated and 30 age ad sex matched controls.

The assessment included an eye exam, static perimetry and OCT.

There are a few issues that should be addressed

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1- First the paper is too long and although the details provided in the introduction and discussion are interesting it dilutes the point of the paper. this should be a report and focussed on the question.

2- Table 1 is informative, but the functional detail provided that do not show a difference could be provided as supplemental information and in exchange the significant structural differences observed could be summarized in table 1. all the rest should be provided as supplemental information.

3- A detail is that in the heading of the pvalue columns, the groups compared could be put in brackets below which would ease the analysis of the table.

4- In group II, it is the unaffected eye that was studied, correct? it is unclear how valuable that group is as the extent of retina damage will be very variable. this should be justified
SPECIFIC TO THE TEXT:

1- I am not sure that 75% of retinoblastoma are unilateral. that may be specific to their population. it should be mentioned that 15% of unilateral cases can carry a germline mutation as written this does not come out.

2- for the OCT as their population includes children they should mention which normative data was use. if they use the machine's that is ok it should be mentioned. OCT should be a subsection of the methods. automated segmentation software use should be mentioned.

Were the case studied all Egyptian?

The discussion should focus on what is significant and not speculate to much

Was any genetic testing done on these cases, whether or not it should be mentioned.

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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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