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Reviewer’s report:

Major issues:
1. In its current state, the level of English throughout your manuscript needs lots of correction, check the manuscript and refine the English language carefully.

2. Title of the manuscript need little correction – authors should delete hyphen(-) in anti-microbial and remove comma (,) after Northeast, Ethiopia.

3. The entire abstract should be rewritten in my observation.

4. In the Abstract background part (line number 21-26) is too much, try to minimize it.

5. In abstract Line no 27- methods should be rewritten, authors should include the sample size.

6. In the Abstract (Line number 37) instead of Coagulase negative staphylococcus should write coagulase negative staphylococci.

7. Line number 41-48 in the abstract conclusion part again this is also too vast, even it contains huge information as compared to the conclusion part of the main document.

8. Authors can start your introduction from reference no. 2. If you delete reference no. 1. nothing will be changed, because the idea in the reference no. 1 is repeated below.

9. Introduction part is too vast, better to summarize it. it will better if you show the problem worldwide, then to Africa then to your study setting instead of discussing the detail science of ocular infection.

10. Line Number 108 -109 Study design and period rewrite it like from February to May 2014.

11. Line Number 120. The study period was 3 months with 22 working days each month. Authors No need to include this information.

12. Line number 123. sample size determination formula is not visible.

13. Line number 126. it will be better if you use include all that came in the study period consecutively.
14. Line number 132. What do you mean when you do pretest? how do you accomplish this

15. Line number 137. Flow is not good should be rewritten. Instead of this (by swabbing the purulent conjunctivitis). you have to write (by using swab from the purulent discharge)

16. Line number 155. Antimicrobial susceptibility test - try to summarize your method. no need to write the details, interested peoples can refer your references

17. Line number 168. Quality control- for the questionnaire part did you do quality cheeks during and after collecting the questionnaires- Did you do quality control for your biochemical process. if yes how do you control the quality of methods in the biochemical tests? try to include that

18. Line number 175. The current name of this institution is Ethiopian Public health Institute (EPHI)

19. Line number 186. Ethical consideration in your result part I can see that you include study participants less than 18 years of age. How ever in your ethical consideration part you did have the ethical ascent (a form for the caregivers or guardian of children). This will question your study from ethical point of view. How do you manage this

20. Line number 198-199. Instead of this (55.11 years with standard deviation of ± 17.85) . Better to use (X, 55.11(SD, +17.85)

21. Line number 313-316 in the Discussion part should be rewritten (some typos error)

22. Line number 331-332 - is this limitation is not a part of this conclusion; Authors better write it in the discussion or other parts of your manuscript.

23. The description of all Tables unclear and should be clearer accurate description needed.

24. The authors should follow the reference style as per the author guideline given in the BMC ophthalmology. Some of the references the authors not used standard Journal abbreviation.
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