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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewer:

We are grateful to the two reviewers and the editor for these very helpful comments, which considerably improved the quality of this paper. Please, find below with ** a description of how we addressed each of the concern raised.

Reviewer #1: This work makes an important contribution to understandings of disability and impairment in Cameroon, and to the field of understanding how these concepts can be studied at population and national levels. As the authors state, this is the first study that we are aware of to look at the complexity of measuring disability prevalence in Cameroon.

It is also a useful article for those who are interested in the history of disability surveys, and who want to understand the differences in survey approaches.

it is important to note a few points.

Disability is culturally and socially constructed, as the authors convey in their paper. Questions related to access are important to consider, and so it is helpful that the authors included that information in their descriptions.

**Could the reviewer provide more clarification? We are not quite sure what ‘access’ is referring to.

I suggest that the authors introduce their understanding of the ICF earlier in the introduction.

**Our understanding of ICF has been added in the introduction (3rd paragraph, line 20-32)
The challenges of considering the similarities and differences of the many languages in Cameroon, including English, French, and Pidgin, could be mentioned more explicitly. Especially when comparing the meaning of words and concepts, this complexity needs to be carefully addressed.

**Details about languages of questionnaires were added in section 2.2 (page 10, line 1-3).** In addition, a paragraph has been added to discuss the issue of languages used during the surveys (See Page 16, line 14-23). We have also run some analyses controlling for the language of the questionnaire in DHS-MICS (which is the only survey collecting this information) and found that the disability prevalence is not significantly associated with the language of questionnaires. Similar results are obtained when questionnaire language is used as control in the multivariable analyses. Translation in local language was rarely done in Yaounde (six observations), which is an urban area, hence we could not control for this information.

it is not clear why the authors did not include older adults in their analyses, so this decision could just be explained.

**HandiVHI survey is limited to adults 15-49, given that the survey is the only one to use the WG definition (the standard) the age group 15-49 has been chosen for all the analyses of the paper. A sentence has been added in the section 2.1 (page 8, line 14-15) to explain this choice.**

Reviewer #2: The main objective of the authors of the document is to evaluate the comparability of different measures of disability used in Cameroon. For which they use different definitions that compare by a "gold standard". However, this cannot be done using a different definition in different surveys or census, so it is not possible to obtain the parameter of interest. The stated objective could be obtained if the different definitions are applied to a single survey or census, only in this way can comparability be achieved. The objective of this document is, in fact, to evaluate the association between sociodemographic characteristics and disability measures, as mentioned in lines 32 to 34 on page 6.

**The comparison of screening instruments has been done using different surveys conducted on different sample, this could limit the comparability of results. However, all the surveys are nationally representative, except HandiVIH, and representative of the population of Yaounde, except ECAM3. Hence, if the comparability is not possible at the individual level, the prevalence at the national and at the level of Yaounde are comparable for most of the surveys and the differences found could be attributable to the instrument used. A paragraph has been added in the discussion section to discuss this point. (page 18, line 19-25)**
Editor comments:

In the introduction you say the following: "This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 displays the data, defines disability, discusses how it has been measured in the main Cameroonian surveys and describes the method used for the analyses. Section 3 presents the results obtained and Section 4 discusses them. Section 5 concludes." I suggest to remove this sentence and use the sections as described in the PHM author guidelines.

**The sentence has been removed and the sections : Background, Methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusions have been used, as described in the PHM author guideline.**

The survey data that you have used to evaluate the consistency of the association between the disability as measured by these surveys and the socio-demographic characteristics is not from exactly the same respondents is it? So differences that you may find could also be attributed to differences in the sample. I suggest you also include a paragraph on this in the discussion section.

**A paragraph was added in the discussion section (page 18, line 19-25)**