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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript from Azad et al. aimed to verify the association between the SNP rs547984 and primary open angle glaucoma (POAG) in a Saudi Arabian patient and control cohort. No association was found and as such, the results presented in the manuscript, adds to data from other patient cohorts, questioning the association of rs547984 with POAG. The manuscript is well written and includes the relevant details in the method section. A few minor points listed below should be addressed to improve the manuscript before publication in the Journal of Negative Results. However, the manuscript would benefit from careful proofreading.

Abstract:

Line 36: What does "numbers of anti-glaucoma medication" mean? How many different medications a given patient is taking?

Line 44ff: How do the authors distinguish between association of rs547984 with clinical parameters and with the SNP being a risk factor for POAG?

Introduction:

Line 15: should read: "the general population" and "the polygenic nature"

Line 33: should read: "GWAS"

Line 50ff: Do the authors refer to the same SNP? Then it should read: "rs547984"

Methods:

P. 5, line 15: should read: "DNA samples were obtained"

P. 6, line 19: should read: "Kolmogorov Smirnov"

P. 6, line 21: should read: "significant difference"
Results:

P. 6, line 41: Should that read: "No significant difference in age and gender distribution…"? If not, it is not clear how a distribution can be significant.

Discussion:

The authors did not find an association of the SNP rs547984 with POAG. Can the authors speculate or do they know of any studies, if the other SNPs may be associated with POAG? What was the rational to pick that specific SNP out of all the other suggested ones? Did this one have the strongest association in the initial GWAS study? May be the rational why looking at this SNP should be explained in the introduction.

Table 3:

Row "Female": Third column should read "9 (50.0)"
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