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Reviewer's report:

The authors collected data from the hospitals' website or directly from the hospitals, to review whether the data reported are consistent with the ICHOM framework.

The data collection methods were not consistent among the hospitals. Besides, did the authors try to explore whether the hospitals report the data in other platforms like the annual reports?

How hospitals comply with the international standard is a great topic. The sampling frame should not be just 9 hospitals. The representativeness is a problem in this study. How can the authors conclude 'outcomes reporting for ophthalmic conditions currently widely varies across hospitals GLOBALLY' using the observation from 8 hospitals?

What are retrospective mixed methods?

What is the sample size estimation for this study? How is the power of this study?

Only descriptive data were reported. It is not enough for the current publication standard. No better statistics for the analysis?

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.

No

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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