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Reviewer's report:

General

Although the authors have included answers to all the previous questions, the answers have not been satisfactory in some cases or in others they have not included them in the text of the article. The general recommendation is to include a summary of the answer to the reviewer in the text of the manuscript in the opportune section, since some of that information will be of interest for the readers of the article. Next, I include the changes that I suggest preserving the number of the questions of the previous revision.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Previous comment # 2) The justification in the selection of the type of questionnaire and questions must be included in the methodology section. The limitations of the selected questionnaire, some of which I mentioned in this previous question, must be included in the discussion.

Previous comment #3) Any tool included in a research study, a questionnaire in this case, must show its validity, including information in the article or a reference to a previous article in which the validation study was performed. For that reason, although the objective of the study is not to evaluate the questionnaire validity, the authors have to make mention in the text to the questionnaire development and validity, and also about its limitations as a measurement tool.

Previous comment #4) The reader will want to see, or will need to know, what type of hospitals are included. Simple descriptive data on the hospitals are an appropriate information in an article of health services research. On the other hand, it is not clear how the information provided by the authors can demonstrate “if the administrative and economical issues may reflect a change in the indicators of appropriate hospital admissions”.

Previous comment #5) This answer must be included as a limitation of the study in the discussion.

Previous comment #6) Again, included it as a limitation of the study in the discussion.

Previous comment #7. Please, include the reference of the website: http://www.ministerosalute.it/programmazione/sdo/ric_informazioni/default.jsp page between the biographical references.

Previous comment #8) I wonder if they could have been able to provide with some additional information from the administrative data (the mentioned as “Hospital Discharge Report” database from the Ministry of Health), in addition to the included in the questionnaire. The data obtained from the “Hospital Discharge Report”, can be contrasted with the corresponding one of the questionnaire, and, in certain way, it could serve to provide some partially validity information over some questions of the questionnaire.

Previous comment #9) You should include a summary of these commentaries in the discussion.

Previous comment #11) Make a mention to other of the possible limitations, or problems, of the study as selection bias and validity of the questionnaire.

Previous comment #12) The reasons described by the authors in this answer must be included in the discussion. In addition, in spite of the differences of the health systems between different countries, and emphasizing this aspect, it is important that the authors compare their results with other publications that have studied the variability in the case of cataract surgery. This is an important part of the discussion when publishing in an international journal.
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

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

Statistical review: No
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