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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract: Results – the increase in blindness could have been due to better reporting. The authors should not call it ‘prevalence’ as it is not a population based study, but rather ‘reported prevalence’ or ‘reported blindness’.


Page 4 Methods: Para 3 last sentence – it is ‘retinitis pigmentosa’ not ‘pigment retinitis’.

Why were these 3 years interval only was taken. Some justification for that should be written.

Page 7 Results: 1st para prevalence word cannot be used as registry depends on self reporting. Use ‘reported prevalence’ or ‘reported blindness’

2 Para : ‘new blindness’ – omit ‘new’.

Only single decimal place for reporting figures.

In discussion authors themselves admit that increase is due to better registration rather than increase in levels of disease. This should be highlighted as a limitation of the ‘registry’ method.

Mention ‘prevalence as per registry’ rather than ‘prevalence’.


Page 10: 2nd para’ Do not repeat results

Shorten discussion.


Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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