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Reviewer's report:

Abstract
Line 2, please correct the aim of the study to “the aim of this study”

Introduction
- Line 13 paragraph 2, please correct neorevascularization to “neovascularization”
- This is a hospital based study, therefore, the term “prevalence” may not be so accurate to use, please change to “frequency of” as “prevalence” can only be assessed in community based studies.
- In the study design, the author states from October to October, does this mean first of October 2004 to 30th of September 2006 ?? if so, please change the sentence to be “from October 2004 through September 2006”.

Methods:
Data Analysis: Please change mean with SD to Mean and standard deviation. Also please change qualitative variables to categorical variables as they are not qualitative data.

Results section:
The authors are dealing with analysis using a “per person” approach, this is quite good for prevention of blindness studies. However, at a certain point of analysis, a “per eye” approach should be used. The drawback of using a per person approach is not accounting for the difference between the eyes and the differential diagnosis per eye as well as the difference in needed treatment. One of the resolutions for this situation is to provide a guideline for how was a bilaterally affected patient treated or categorized ?? Otherwise, a per eye detail should be presented.
The authors mention that the Cameroon has a huge diversity in ethnicity, meanwhile, we don’t see any information about whether this issue was taken into consideration in the analysis or not? The reason behind this is the nowadays proves association between genetics and hereditary factors and DR. given that the study is a prospective cohort, such issues should have been covered well in the analysis.

Discussion:
Please rephrase the sentence: collaborating with these reports to something like: in agreement with these studies. Again, the same expression is not correct “a finding which is collaborates” please consider English editing and terminology.

Please also correct Khandekar study in Omam to Oman.

Also, at the end of the discussion (the patients leaving in rural, change to living in rural). Please conduct a thorough English editing review.

Conclusion:

As explained, using the term prevalence can’t be accurate for hospital based study, also, the authors build their main message on generalization of results to all Cameroon (prevalence is high in Cameroon) I would suggest decreasing the tone here, to something like, the prevalence may be high in Cameroon.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.