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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have responded to some of the reviewer comments. The paper is clearly improved from before, but some key points raised by reviewers still need to be addressed. Sometimes the author’s responses and the manuscript do not match.

Major compulsory revisions:

1) In methods the author should explain how the patient’s “main diagnosis” (Table 2) was assigned when the child had multiple ocular morbidities (see my previous Q3 and comments from other reviewers).

2) In response to my previous Q14 author says that the 47 cases with main diagnosis of active trachoma is the total of all active trachoma. This means that if active trachoma was present, it was always chosen as the main diagnosis, even if another diagnosis was present. This should be stated in the methods.

3) When giving the causes of visual impairment in the 119 children with bilateral visual impairment, was this the same diagnosis as the “main diagnosis” used for Table 2? If it was the same as the main diagnosis, this should be stated in methods. Otherwise methods should explain how the cause of visual impairment was decided.

4) Amblyopia definition is still incomplete in text. Give definitions for anisometricropic amblyopia and refractive amblyopia.

Minor essential revisions:

5) Define “CO” in abstract and text.

6) Response to my previous Q1 is inconsistent with manuscript:

   Response says
   “Refraction was underwent for those with decreased VA (for those their age is greater than 7 years) and for all children whose age was less than 7 years.

   Text says:
   “Those children whose age is greater than 5 years and had decreased visual acuity not attributable to another cause at presentation, and all less than 5 years old underwent refraction.”
7) Response to my previous Q4 is inconsistent with manuscript. 

Response says:

“Yes, I have mentioned that if the child had decreased vision the examiner sent him/her to vision centre/refraction clinic/ for refraction, the experienced optometrist underwent objective and subjective refraction and then rechecked with correction to confirm RE is the cause for the visual impairment.”

However, I do not see this anywhere in the manuscript methods.
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