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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very well done and important study, to which this authors has little to add.

WHO guidelines may not be known to every reader and should be briefly described (targets, etc.).

The authors mention that self-reported barriers to eye healthcare were assessed in the NIEHS, but are not further described in the report. Please add some information as to what the most important barriers were and how this relates to the results presented.

Generally, the fact that the proportion of indigenous population in any region could be seen as a proxy for remoteness and or low socio-economic status is only mentioned briefly. How was this (collinearity?) addressed in the analyses? Are there other studies which have looked at this in more detail which allow the authors to not assume that this is a confounder? Additionally, it merits further discussion.

The categories “low medium” and “high medium” are a little bit confusing. Can these be changed or are there particular reasons the authors have chosen these?

Abstract: Results, last sentence: 3% of what?

A few typos need correction throughout the manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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