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Author’s response to reviews:

Response Letter RE: BOPH-D-19-00794R1

Dear Dr Pilat and colleagues,

Many thanks for your review of our article. Please find below our responses to comments:

Reviewer 1: There were no suggestions for review from Reviewer 1.

Reviewer 2:

1. ‘If possible, it would be interesting to provide an explanation for the fact that in Scotland the incidence of secondary paediatric glaucoma was significantly higher compared to the BIG-study, and this rate is probably higher due to the possibility of underestimation.’

a. We feel that a combination of ethnicity and underestimation are responsible. Please see the ‘Discussion’ section, lines 181-186, for an addition in response to this.
2. ‘Also, if possible, it would be interesting to report the ethnicity of affected children (Caucasian, Asian, African, American etc), as this might explain the observed differences in the reported rate of glaucoma between regions. However, I am not sure if the authors can do this in the current study, as their survey relied on clinician's recalling numbers of patients seen.’

a. We did not record ethnicity in our survey.

3. ‘Page 6, line 135: "preforming" should be "performing".’

a. This has been amended as suggested.

We hope that we have satisfactorily addressed the points raised in the review process. Please let us know if there is anything further we can provide.

Yours,

Frederick R. Burgess