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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is well written and describes an interesting and important topic on the utilization of eye care services.

However, I have an important issue with this analyses and it relates to the comment in the study limitations section.

"Lastly, we were unable to account for patients receiving care from optometrists because the database did not capture such services. It is also plausible that residents outside of Charlottetown received eye care from alternate publicly funded sources such as primary care practices and emergency departments.” This statement rather suggests that it is quite possible that services are provided outside of the main cities and covered by publicly funded sources. This would be fairly consistent with what happens in many countries.

This aspect needs to be accounted for in the manuscript, before any statements on the need for ophthalmologists or other services being extended are made.

Minor issues, alter the term 'diabetics' to 'people with diabetes'
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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