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Reviewer's report:

The authors have improved their paper in light of the comments from the reviewers. There are still steps needed to be taken before it is of a standard suitable for publication, in my view.

Major compulsory revisions.
Some of these are reiterated from my first review, as they had not been incorporated:
1. The discussion is still much too long. The details on other risk factors for cataract in this study is not really relevant and can be substantially reduced.
2. There is a fundamental difference between risk (i.e. cumulative incidence) and odds, and these terms cannot be used inter-changeably. In particular, your conclusion in the abstract is not correct, i.e. "the use of rice straw increases risk... the use of cow dung fuel... reduces the risk". All that can be concluded from a case-control study is that the odds of exposure is higher or lower among cases compared to controls. This MUST be corrected in the abstract, and in the discussion.
3. The final conclusion is still too strong. Further studies and biological support needs to be obtained before this recommendation can be made. Perhaps the authors can rephrase this to say "may be a useful approach, but further evidence is needed".
4. It is not usual to present p-values to 3 d.p. unless the p-value is less than 0.01. I would suggest giving all p-values to 2 d.p., and those that are <0.01 to 3 d.p. (or more as appropriate).
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