

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	A survey of attitudes of glaucoma subspecialists in England and Wales to visual field test intervals in relation to NICE guidelines
AUTHORS	Malik, Rizwan; Baker, Helen; Russell, Richard; Crabb, David

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Selena Gray Professor of Public Health University of the West of England, Bristol
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Feb-2013

RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	I would like a little more discussion as to whether individuals behaviour is the same as their hypothetical behaviour; and whether we should be exploring more low tech options for visual field monitoring; the trade off between low tech and frequent versus high tech and less frequent.
----------------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Nitin Anand Consultant Ophthalmology Calderdale & Huddersfield NHS Trust Lindley Huddersfield HD3 3EA
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Feb-2013

GENERAL COMMENTS	Introduction Line 39-40, a minor error. Correct to '6 visual fields in two years'
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: Selena Gray

I would like a little more discussion as to whether individuals behaviour is the same as their hypothetical behaviour; and whether we should be exploring more low tech options for visual field monitoring; the trade off between low tech and frequent versus high tech and less frequent.

The hypothesis was that all the specialists would follow NICE guidelines for VF monitoring. This was disproven. A sentence has been added (lines 191-3)

Regarding other options for VF testing, there is no current alternative method available for 'low tech' testing that is validated, cheaper and more efficient. However, the use of alternative tests to VF, such as imaging may help in reducing the number of VF tests needed over a given period of monitoring (lines 233-6).

Reviewer: Nitin Anand

Introduction Line 39-40, a minor error. Correct to '6 visual fields in two years'
Agree. Typographical error now corrected (lines 87-88)