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PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This is a well-written study evaluating the outcomes of nonpenetrating deep sclerectomy and trabeculectomy for glaucoma. The work is correctly introduced to nonexperts in the field, the aims are clearly stated, and the procedures are correctly designed. Also, the results are clearly presented and honestly discussed. I have some comments outlined as following:

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

- One point needing clarification is the statistical analysis. The authors opted for a nonparametric test, but the reason for this choice is not explained. In my opinion, the best option could be an analysis of variance for repeated measures, as the same patients were investigated before and after the surgical intervention. Indeed, data are presented as mean and standard deviation instead of median and interquartile range values, as would be required for data not following a normal distribution. The same comment applies to the other statistical analyses. In particular, why the Pearson instead of the Spearman correlation analysis?

- As a minor point, the authors used several abbreviations that made it more difficult to read the manuscript. Some of them are not spelled out (as in the case of Spectral Domain Optical Coherence Tomography), and others seem to be redundant.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I think that figures and tables should be better arranged. Table caption and legend should be followed by the corresponding table. The figures' panels should be identified by letters.
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:
Acceptable
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