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Reviewer's report:

The authors present an interesting hypothesis that retinal thickness maybe lower in PACS patient as compared to the normal due to fewer number of RGCs.

In addition to the limitations already mentioned, the following are some serious concerns regarding the study.

1. Abstract section states 35 PACS patients were included while the result section states that only 30 eyes were included.

2. The signal strength in the Spectralis OCT is depicted by the quality score which should ideally be greater than 25 (and not 16).

3. Dave et al.(2016) in their article describing normal asymmetry of PPAA parameters in children have shown that the 2.5 to 97.5 percentile limit for interocular asymmetry for total PPAA macular thickness parameter ranged for -9 to 21 microns. In absence of other studies in adults, one can only assume a similar variation which occurs normally even in adults. With this background, the authors mean difference of close to 10 microns in the retinal thickness between the 2 groups though statistically significant may not be clinically significant.
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