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Reviewer's report:

Reviewer's comments.

The authors have attempted to answer many of the questions raised and implemented many of the suggestions. However, I still have much concern for the ways some of the results were presented, and the style of English used in expressing and discussing the results. Some claims were made in both the introduction and discussion that need referencing. Judging from the response to my previous comments, I am confident that the authors will make all the necessary corrections.

Major compulsory revision

1. Background:

   • The 2nd to the last sentence “The widespread use of traditional medical remedies and practices for the treatment of common diseases and ailments has, of recent, prompted the Federal Government of Nigeria to initiate and fund research activities to identify useful traditional herbal medicines” need to be referenced. Perhaps, the authors may find this reference useful: Adesina SK. Traditional medical care in Nigeria. http://www.onlinenigeria.com/links/LinksReadPrint.asp?blurb=574

2. Methods:

   • Quite a number of the sentences need to be re-phrased. For example, the opening sentence should read “The University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital (UNTH), Enugu, was established in 1971 and is one of the first generation public tertiary hospitals in Nigeria”.

   • Study population and design: Merge study design and population together. This should read “This was a comparative cross-sectional study involving all newly presenting ophthalmic patients who presented consecutively”

3. Results:

   • Authors have stated the months and years of the study in the methods, therefore, it is unnecessary to state this again. This should be deleted.

   • Some of the results should be re-phrased, results presented in both values and percentages should be in brackets and the dash (-) before them be deleted.

4. Discussion:
• The authors have compared their results with those from other countries. Rather than referring to the countries where the previous studies were done, authors have consistently referred to the names of the authors. This will leave many readers, like me, to refer to the reference list many times so as to be able to follow the discussion very well. The authors should therefore correct these throughout the manuscript.

• The main points in the discussion have been lumped together, may I suggest that the authors do proper paragraphing of the discussion. For example, the section on adverse reaction of TEM should start on a new paragraph.

• Limitations are supposed to be part of the discussion; therefore they should not be titled separately. Similarly, the limitations should not be numbered. The first limitation should be re-written as “The prevalence of TEM use is a better way of knowing the total population of ophthalmic patients using TEM, unfortunately, we have evaluated only the incidence of TEM use since our focus was on newly presenting ophthalmic patients only. Thus our study was biased towards underestimating TEM use.

5. Conclusion:

• The study did not support the claim that “The resort to TEM use reflects areas of eye health needs not met by the existing
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