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Reviewer reports:

Shin Goo Park (Reviewer 1): This study is meaningful as a study of eye examinations for many people.

Responded: Thanks for the affirmation.

However, this study suggests only unadjusted prevalence, so it is necessary to present the adjusted prevalence (such as age, sex…) in table 2.

Responded: Data on adjusted prevalence in table 2 is now added.

Table 3, which explains the causes of blindness, would require a more elaborate analysis.

Responded: More analysis on causes of blindness is added mainly on table 3.

Wool Suh (Reviewer 2): This is a well organized cross-sectional study in Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous region, China.
Responded: Thanks for positive comment.

1. In discussion, line 20

This survey has demonstrated the magnitude and causes of blindness, visual impairment in Han Chinese and minority ethnic group in Altay and Tacheng, Xinjiang.

-> The aim of this study is to ascertain the prevalence and causes of blindness, visual impairment, uptake of cataract surgery among different ethnic group, as written in abstract.

   But the sentence in line 20 could confuse the readers whether it compare the Han chineses and other minority ethnic group, or compare four groups. I recommend the correction of the sentence.

Responded: Thanks for the suggestion. The sentence is now changed. This should be the results found from minority groups compared with Han Chinese.

2. Table 3

   13. all other globe/CNS abnormalities

-> there is no comment about 13 in manuscript.

Responded: Explanation of globe/CNS abnormalities is now added to the manuscript.

3. There is a clear data proven and conclusion in this study. In addition, this study include the very important data in prevalence.

   But in discussion, the some results was simply repeated in discussion. Reviewer did no information about ethnical backgrouns, for example, just genetic difference or other life stye difference depending on ethenic groups. Reviewers recommand more detailed explanation about study results and expect to improve more powerful, valuable study.

Responded: Thanks, some more information on the minorities were added to introduction and discussion sessions.