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Reviewer's report:

The authors have markedly improved the manuscript and have made great progress in addressing the comments and suggestions of both reviewers. As a result, the paper has a clearer presentation and purpose. There is still room for improvement. Thank for trying to address your written English which I understand can be difficult. In this respect there is a need for further checking and corrections. I point out some of these as examples in the abstract, but believe the journal staff should assist you for your entire document which requires this minor attention.

My main points in need of a response is the avoidance of the comments of reviewer with respect to the design effect. The second point being I still believe there is little to be gained in long lists of active trachoma prevalence from around Ethiopia and elsewhere unless these serve a useful purpose. There are significant blocks of text that are simply quoting percentages. I think these can be reduced or the significance of the comparative regions or populations selected needs to be stated e.g. same geography, similar study type, pastoralist population.

Abstract

Line 16: in sub-Saharan Africa trachoma is still a public health concern

Line 23: A systematic sampling technique

Line 28: A total of 406 children aged 1-9 years have participated, 89 (22%) [95% CI: 18.0-25.6%] were positive for active trachoma.
"Line 29: Of these cases, trachomatous inflammation-follicular and trachomatous inflammation-intense cases were constituted 75(84%) and 14(16%), respectively."

Better as something like this

Line 29: Of these cases, 75 (84%) had trachomatous inflammation-follicular and 14 (16%) had trachomatous inflammation-intense.

Line 81: aged 1-8? Is this correct not 1-9?

Line 169: The questioner was pretested - is this what you mean - the person or interviewer was tested by actually collecting data or was the series of questions asked by the interviewer pretested as you say later. This needs clarification its either the questionnaire or the interviewer.

Line 193: household who fetch water after 16-30 mins - the instances of this needs changing in English this could translate that after at time of walking about, then the households go and collect water (between 16 and 30 mins). Really this is time or walking distance to the water source. So really this should be "children from households within 16-30 min water source (is that a protected or unprotected?)."

In the discussion you still have the lists of trachoma prevalence (lines 221-225). Whilst these are relevant overall simply showing percentages as higher or lower without any context is not that informative. I would suggest many of these can be cut down and reduced.
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