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Reviewer’s report:

1. Regarding the study title: a little bit similar to that in reference 10 M Takanori, M Nagata, M Matsumura, et al. effects of combined trabeculotomy and sinusotomy compared to trabeculotomy alone. Acta Ophthalmol Scand. 2000; 78(2): 191-5. I would recommend specifying it to a certain area e.g he long-term outcome of trabeculotomy: comparison with filtering surgery in Japan for instance.

2. In background section: the authors referred to MIGS in page 4, lines 27-35, I do not think this is relevant to the study question so please remove it or justify its presence in fewer words.

3. In the methods section: please clarify the exact technique of sinusotomy whether it’s a full thickness sclerotomy (hence it is a trabeculectomy) or deroofing of Schlem’s canal (hence how can a punch be used without accidental perforation of the floor of the canal), also how can you compare the results of the cases with and without sinusotomy, this is another added variable to the results and considered a confounder?!!

4. In the discussion section: Again no need to state the value of MIGS, this is out of the scope of your work.

5. The sample size: I appreciate the difficulty in matching retrospective data for 2 groups but the previous work in reference number 10 included 91 glaucoma cases opposing yours (45 overall number) this is a small sample relative to the long follow up period, you may have excluded drop-outs and this has to be justified.

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.

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
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