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**Reviewer's report:**

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. **Is the question posed by the authors well defined?**

   The question posed is important and well defined. The manuscript highlights that repeated mass oral azithromycin distributions have reduced active trachoma in the community. However, the prevalence of active trachoma remains very high. The main contribution of this manuscript is to draw attention to broader interventions for adequate control of trachoma such as fly control program, water supply changes, measures to improve face washing and construction of latrines.

2. **Are the methods appropriate and well described?**

   The eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants were correctly described. However, the questionnaire needs to be described and also each variable with details of methods of assessment (measurement). WHO trachoma simplified grading system, its variables and categories also need to be described in detail.

   Explain in Data Collection section how information about environment was obtained (results presented in page 7, second and third paragraphs). Explore possible interrelationships between environmental variables and prevalence: assess the prevalence of trachoma according to type of water supply (safe and clean, rivers, streams, untreated water, etc.) and well as other environmental variables.

   Explain in results why coverage of sample size was not 100%. Give reasons for non-participation.

3. **Are the data sound?**

   Yes

4. **Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?**

   Yes

5. **Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?**

   Yes

6. **Are limitations of the work clearly stated?**
No. Please discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The study’s design should be mentioned in the title.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   The manuscript needs language corrections.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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