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Reviewer's report:

Fairly well organized simple straightforward paper answering a pertinent question. 1. But how was the sample size arrived at? The number seems rather large for a 5 week data gathering period bearing in mind that only approx. 2400 altogether were operated upon in 2013. Using this figure and sampling every one in 3 persons could not have given such a large figure in 5 weeks (probably only about 65 to 70 persons assuming everyone met the criteria). Certainly all could not have met the inclusion criteria. Authors should please clarify.

2. In addition a major problem with this paper is that the occupation and thus indirect nonmedical costs like losing time off work was not factored into this study. While this may be the only Nigerian paper on costs of cat surgery (hard to believe) it is certainly not the only paper detailing economic burdens of ophthalmic conditions. See a related paper on the economic burden of glaucoma by Adio AO and Onua A. You might be able to draw some comparisons and also see where the two papers differ.

3. Are you saying the subsidy by sight savers is not enough and that more should be done for the people? What kind of interventions will reduce costs for the vulnerable? Your conclusion should be able to state or proffer some ideas on this.
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