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Reviewer's report:

Major comments
1) The major issue addressed (latent TB infection in healthcare worker) is important one, but similar data on this issue have recently been reported from many settings.

2) Introduction: What’s the current guideline for screening latent TB or active TB for healthcare worker in Germany? The description of shortcomings of current guideline will be needed to explain the objective of current study.

3) Methods: The flow chart to explain the participants status for enrollment, results of IGRA and TST will be helpful for understanding.

4) Methods: For TST, the methods of TST and positive criterion will be needed.

5) Methods: In my opinion, the participants who had previous TB history are excluded to estimate the prevalence of latent TB infection. The positive results of TST or IGRA could be affected by the previous TB history.

6) Results: The additional table for explaining the major result (positive results TST and IGRA) will be helpful for understanding the results.

7) Results: page 8, as mentioned above, I’m not sure whether the previous TB history could be considered the risk factor of latent TB infection.

8) Results: In 1497 participants who underwent both TST and IGRA, the analysis of discordant results and the comparison of risk factor for positive results for both tests would be informative to understand the differences and similarities of the two tests.

9) Discussion: page 10 first paragraph, what’s the previous prevalence of latent TB infection through the TST in Germany? What’s the cause of the discrepancy of prevalence of LTBI compared to previous study? Is there any relation of BCG vaccination strategy in Germany?

Minor comments
1) Methods: The description for the participants who included previous study (Nienhaus et al, Schabolin et al) will be needed in methods section

2) Results: page 7, second paragraph, 54.2% and 68.7% in head of sentence could be replaced by the characters.

3) Discussion: page 11, second paragraph, the expression of age seems to have
an error: under 25: < 25.
4) Table 1 and 2: age: seems to have an error: under 25, < 25
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