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Reviewer's report:

Although some glaucomatologists like the reviewer rely much on RNFL photography for the diagnosis and monitoring of the disease, there is a paucity of scientific reports regarding photographic retinal nerve fiber layer defect in glaucoma. In that regards, I am happy to review the paper.

Diabetes and systemic hypertension may be related with the RNFL defect. How the authors controlled the systemic diseases?

The results section is too short. In addition, the results are straightforward, because RNFL defect width would be correlated with the disease severity and VF indexes such as MD, PSD, VFI would also be correlated with the disease severity. Therefore, the authors may need to provide more information and add some subgroup analysis. For example, how about the minimal angle β (+c) for the glaucomatous visual field defects? How about the results in respect to the glaucoma subtypes (NTG, POAG or secondary glaucoma)? How would be the results if the authors subdivided the study group into single RNFL defect group vs multiple RNFL defects group? Superior vs inferior RNFL defects may influence differently on the central visual field defect (Macular Vulnerability Zone, Hood C et al, Progress in Retinal and Eye Research 2013;32:1-21), thus subgroup analysis for this aspect may also be needed. The authors may collect cases with central VF defects first and then analyze the RNFL characteristics accordingly.

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.

No
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 am able to assess the statistics

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