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Reviewer's report:
I appreciate the efforts made by the authors to address the reviewers' comments, and the paper is greatly improved. There are however still a few points which are not fully clarified.

Unresolved comments on first submission
Abstract line 7 (and elsewhere in methods and results) The authors still use confusing terminology regarding the "questionnaire", now using the same word to describe the combination of 6 questionnaires, and the individual questionnaires themselves. I would suggest describing the event as a "questionnaire" which used six different "instruments", with these questionnaires taking place at three "timepoints" (rather than "moments" as used in page 7 line1).
Page 4 line 4 Thank you to the authors for adding the logMAR notation, but visual acuity of <0.05 is actually logMAR <1.3 rather than <1.5.
Page 4 line 21 Thank you for adding the Bray et al citation. However the aids tested are "ELECTRONIC vision enhancement systems". Also p16 line 17 incorrectly says that the study compares two optical aids. Page 4 line 21 incorrectly talks about "neither of these" studies, but for three studies it should be "none of these".
The Figure 1 is a very helpful addition to show the dropouts. However it still lacks detail about the recruitment stage. We still don't know how many people were offered training and declined, and (more importantly) how many people had training but were not part of the study. This is important so we know how representative this group might be of the whole population. The paper says
"Those who were interested in the ICT training were assigned to an assessor who performed the intake and judged whether the ICT training would be feasible and appropriate. During the intake, enrollees were asked if they were willing to participate in the study. Clients willing to participate then gave their informed consent."
So the numbers at each stage need to be included in Figure 1, along with the details of how the assessor makes the judgement on the appropriateness of training. These assessments presumably take some time and so they should be included in the cost-effectiveness calculation.

The drop-out data still isn't clear about how much training (some) participants underwent before dropping-out. I still believe that these people create some costs, and yet can't be shown to gain any benefit from the training.

The authors didn't address my point about some people who had not completed training "within the study period". Did this mean that their training was particularly lengthy, and therefore more costly? If they are not being counted this would artificially lower the mean training cost.

Page 6 line 13 What use was made of the information gathered on level of education?

The authors respond that "it is important to know the composition of the sample. It can be assumed that the level of education will have an effect on the total training time required as well as how severe the visual impairment is. For example, a high-educated person may learn faster and, hence, may not require an extensive ICT training or may not be as severely impaired, and therefore capable of completing a higher education level opposed to a person who is severely impaired."

However I have searched through the paper and cannot find any analysis of education vs. training time.

New comments on revised version

Page 5 line 15 describes the cost-effectiveness as being "compared to no training". However this is not correct, because there is no control group.

In response to Reviewer 2, the authors say "Moreover, conform the recent advice of the American Statistical Association (http://www.amstat.org/asa/files/pdfs/P-ValueStatement.pdf), researchers should focus less on p-values, and more on the relevance of coefficients (e.g. the magnitude of the gain in well-being and/or quality of life)." However the authors have not made any attempt to do this in the paper - what exactly would be the functional consequence of an increase in ICECAP-O from 0.77 to 0.81?

Typo Page 11 line 13 "had an in informal caregiver" has an incorrect extra word
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

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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Quality of written English
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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