Reviewer’s report

Title: Association of Photopic and Mesopic Contrast Sensitivity in Older Drivers with Risk of Motor Vehicle Collision Using Naturalistic Driving Data

Version: 1 Date: 09 Dec 2019

Reviewer: Bradley Dougherty

Reviewer's report:

My comments have generally been adequately addressed, and I continue to feel that this is a well written paper describing a quality study of an important topic. With respect to my comment about adding description of the way that mileage was adjusted for, we disagree about just how familiar all readers will be with the language used in describing Poisson regression models and exactly what it means. Specifically, the phrase "Models were fit using a log-link, log of miles driven as the offset..." is the only bit of language I could find regarding adjusting for driving exposure. It's an obvious strength of the study that naturalistic recording allows for adjustment for exposure, a luxury which many previous studies on similar topics have not enjoyed. It's a minor point, but to me it's an opportunity to just use plain language to say something important and make sure all readers clearly understand what was done. I am aware it's not a methods paper and agree that no elaborate description is warranted. I had a sentence or two somewhere in mind.
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