Reviewer’s report

Title: Segmentation Error in Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography measures of the retinal nerve fibre layer thickness in Idiopathic Intracranial Hypertension

Version: 0 Date: 02 Jul 2017

Reviewer: Sandra Liakopoulou

Reviewer's report:

The authors report relevant segmentation errors for RNFL thickness measurements in eyes with papilledema. Overall the study is performed well, the results are relevant for clinicians and the manuscript is nicely written. I have some comments:

1) Please explain in the methods why you used Image J instead of the quantitative values provided by the OCT software.

2) Please state how many cases have been included for the comparison between independent raters and delete the word "estimated" in the results row 6

3) Please provide figure legends

4) Autosegmentation in neovascular AMD is incorrect in the majority of cases, thus I recommend to edit the sentence in the introduction starting with "auto segmentation has been found to..." as this suggest automated segmentation is usually correct in NVAMD.

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.

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.
Not relevant to this manuscript

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