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Review for Human Resources for Health (2)
Thanks for asking me to review this interesting paper: Human Resources for Eye Health in Sub-Saharan Africa: Trends and Implications for Achieving VISION 2020 by Year 2020' Kindly find comments below.

1. The question posed by the authors is new and well defined
2. The methods are appropriate sufficient details need to be provided to replicate the work..
3. Data is sound and fairly well controlled. Sources of bias should be in detail enumerated and suggestions as to their effect on the data stated
4. The manuscript adhere to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition
5. Discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data
6. The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found. .For individual member countries to benefit from the findings details of some specific are required
7. The writing is acceptable for publication

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

1. The category of cataract surgeon was it uniformly defined in all member countries. How many member countries had non physician cataract surgeon, the member countries who train diplomat were they categorised as ophthalmologists?
The cadre of ophthalmic clinical officers are found in which member countries or in all?

How reliable is the publicly available data on CSR in member countries, authors should please state where estimates were used so that the data can be interpreted with caution.

2. What informed the choice or selection of 21 countries out of 44-47 Sub Saharan member countries?

3. Previous works submitted (Palmer et al) may be inaccessible to the readers fair details should be given in this paper.
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  1. Second paragraph in discussion appears confusing, the terms surgeons, cataract surgeons, appear used interchanged.
  2. Background first statement should be reconstructed for ease of understanding. Introduction last statement is unclear, are the authors referring to this study or studies in the past
- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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