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Reviewers report:

The authors of "Practice scope and job confidence of two-year trained optometry technicians in Eritrea" have done a good job of tracking trainees and collecting data about their practice.

There are a few areas of concern that I would like to highlight:

1. The manuscript requires a bit of grammar and syntax editing.
2. In the abstract, and in the final conclusion, the authors say: "With better facility, improvement in infrastructure and further education and career opportunity, the two year trained OTs could be better utilized in the Eritrean eye care system." This is a speculation since you haven't tested it. Please consider using the words Possibly or Perhaps or Might to indicate the fact that you can't say for sure, based on your results, if it will work.
3. In data analysis, the authors say "The confidence score for each of 5 domains were calculated as the percentage score of total category value (number of skills assessed multiplied by 3 for each skill)." This is difficult to understand - why was it multiplied by 3?
4. The authors have proposed to analyse the data using Pearson's correlation, Student T-test and ANOVA (Pearson's correlation coefficient was to assess the relationship between the category confidence score and age and duration of active job, whereas student t test was used to calculate the difference in score in between different sex and one-way ANOVA for current location (Zoba) groups. A p-value less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant) yet no analysis results are shared or discussed. I suggest that the study could be presented as a descriptive one rather than an observational one.
5. In the results, the authors state "Presbyopia and myopia were reported to be the commonest refractive error seen". Presbyopia is a failure of accommodation and not a refractive error - please amend throughout the manuscript.
6. In the discussion, the authors list the limitations of the study right in the beginning. It might be better to list them after discussing the findings so as not to throw off the reader.
7. The entire second paragraph of the discussion ("The diploma level course enrolls students ....") belongs in the methods section where the enrolled sample is described. Table 4 should really be table 1, in that case.
8. Reference number seven (Asmara College of Health Sciences. Curriculum for diploma in optometry technicians. Asmara, Eritrea 2009.) has spelling mistakes and does not indicate where the reference can be sourced.
9. References need attention. Some article titles are in sentence case and others in sentence case. Please check journal style guidelines and amend.
10. The authors mention Zoba several times in the text. It might be a good idea to explain to the reader (the first time it is mentioned) about its significance to the study.
11. Tables should be stand-alone. Please expand abbreviations in the footnotes
12. Similarly, the table titles (all tables, where required) and column headers (Table 2) could be a bit more descriptive to aid understanding.
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