

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Narrowing the gap between eye care needs and service provision: optimising the flow of personnel through a multiple entry and exit training programme.

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 12 February 2009

**Reviewer:** Kovin Naidoo

### **Reviewer's report:**

#### Major Compulsory changes

This article is very difficult to read and understand. I would suggest that the author describes the overall model and approach a bit even though this has been done in the other paper sent for publication.

It is also too descriptive and lacks critical aspects of relevance difficulty to utilise etc. Advantages and Disadvantages should be elaborated.

The term multiple entry and exit has been used in a different context in eye care i.e. in a vertical model aimed at allowing progression within a particular profession. The articulation across different professions to the extent proposed by the author is much more contentious and complex and should be phrased differently. Maybe calling it Multiple Professional Entry and Exit model or similar.

I believe that the paper should be worked on significantly before publication and should be resubmitted. This is excellent work and the value is lost in the current format of the paper.

#### Minor Essential Revisions

The author should not write in the first person.

I have emailed the pdf file with changes

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

### **Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.