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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The authors have described outcomes of and barriers to cataract surgery in Sao Paolo State, and concluded that higher age, greater distance to the hospital, municipalities with fewer inhabitants and less ophthalmic services were the barriers to cataract surgery. The data presentation and statistics are appropriate for the article, and there is a minor revision needed for the paper.

1. Page 11, line 40 and Page 12, line 30-32: the final postoperative visit. Please include the mean time and standard deviation.

2. There are three common types of age-related cataract: nuclear, cortical, and posterior subcapsular. It is believed that their causes, environmental and genetic, differ both qualitatively and quantitatively. When searching for the quality of surgery and the final VA, these different types of cataract may provide valuable information.

3. Multivariate analysis may be used to determine the independent predictors, which mostly influenced the barriers to cataract surgery.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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