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Reviewer's report:

The authors must be congratulated for a well conducted, interesting study.

- My major concern is the small number of eyes in each group. Given the fact that the purpose of this study is to compare the changes in the lamina cribrosa and other morphological parameters of the ONH (including the choroidal thickness) between NPDS and Trabeculectomy, an statistical power calculation should have been done and stated in the methods section. It is possible that the power of the present study is low, so it might well be that even clinically relevant differences in some of the parameters studied (between NPDS and trabeculectomy) would have not been detected. Throughout the discussion, and in the conclusion, this fact (i.e. the power that the current study has, and the possibility that differences may exist but may be undetected) should be mentioned and discussed.

- Page 7, line 159. If the data distribution is not normal (as it seems) then it is not appropriate to show the results as the mean and the standard deviation. The median and the range should be used instead.

- Page 11, line 270. The references are misquoted and do not support the statement that the current study is larger than three studies analyzing OCT parameters after trabeculectomy. Reference 23 analyzes 23 eyes, ref 25 studies 20 eyes and ref 32 reports results on 14 eyes. The current study analyzes 11 trabeculectomies.

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.

Unable to assess

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.
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Quality of written English
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