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In this study, the authors assessed the correlation between localized RNFL defects on photographs and glaucoma severity measured by HVF. While their observations are valid, there are many issues with the manuscript.

1. Of the 227 eyes reviewed, only 38 eyes were included. This is a major limitation of using RNFL defects on photographs for glaucoma care.

2. A control population was not included in this study. Given that the measurements of RNFL defects are performed manually, control subjects without VF loss would be important to provide validity to the method.

3. Inter-reader agreement between the three readers should be reported.

4. The authors mentioned integration of this method into artificial intelligence but provided no evidence or support for this. Any reference to AI should be removed unless the authors can justify their argument.

5. In the introduction, the authors speculated contributions if correlations were detected. However, correlation between the defect angle and paracentral loss was not detected. Hence, parts of this section is not relevant to the findings.

6. If the goal of the study is to use RNFL photographs in developing countries, where OCT is not available, then the study should be done to compare the two methods and see if RNFL photograph are comparable to OCT of the RNFL.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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