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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are major issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:
This is a very simple study presenting a sample of measurements and a few correlations.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Introduction. On the assumption that this paper is destined for an ophthalmic journal, you don't really need to explain what the macular is a make multiple references to diseases that affect the macula - this is not relevant to the study. The introduction could be much simpler with a focus on oct measurement in normal eyes and ethnic variability.
Sample is not population based, it is a clinic sample, and it is retrospectively collected. This needs to be acknowledged in the discussion and a statement to the effect that this sample cant be considered to be representative of the middle eastern population needs to be added. It's not clear why you want to perform correlation analyses. However, if you do, you need to model the between eye correlation into the analysis.

The authors are missing the opportunity to lay out the differences between populations in a clear, and citable way. Please consider adding a table, even if it is just foveal thickness, with your results compared to a other published results so the reader can see for themselves what is thick and thin etc. Ideally, estimate statistical significance of the differences. Then your discussion can be neater and simpler.

This, is there a clinically important conclusion you can draw? Is there something about these results that will actually matter to clinicians or instrument manufacturers so that this research could be worth reading or citing?

Grammar:
Abstract conclusion: Should "interrupt" be "interpret"?

Spelling:
Abstract: "Multiviabe" should be "Multivariate"

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

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.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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