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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have revised this article and I welcome the additions made, expanding on the WHO survey conducted.

I cannot follow the changes made to the abstract- perhaps this is not the revised form? There is still an error in the use of OCA1 instead of OCA2- please check the suggestions I made in my previous review about the changes to the abstract, under 'minor essential revisions'.

The citations of references ia also sometimes unclear/incorrect eg on page 5 in the first line the Kromberg reference is given as 1989 whereas it is 1982 in the reference list (ref number 11). Also on this page, in the section on Zimbabwe, paragraph 2, the reference on Harare data should be the Kagore and Lund paper (reference 14).

The suggestions for action made by the authors on page 10 have all been suggested before by workers in southern Africa eg in the Lund and Gaigher (2002) reference and in the review in reference 6 (Lund, 2005), so these could be referenced as supporting these action points the authors outline.

---------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

---------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Check abstract for points made in previous review, especially the use of OCA2 as the type of albinism commonly found in Africa (not OCA1).

Check citation of references.

---------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

As stated in the first review of this paper.