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Reviewer's report:

A.- Major Compulsory Revisions (with proposed solutions)

The discussion and conclusions are not well balanced and adequately supported by the data. There are two sentences that the authors must not include in the article. We include both sentences below (1 and 2).

If the authors agree with the proposes we do them in our opinion the article can be accepted.

1.- Abstract:

Some conclusions are not closely related to material and methods and results. The following sentence can be included in the discussion, nevertheless it can not be included in abstract’s conclusion: MRI can be used as a harmless imaging alternative for some subgroups of patients (children, fertile women, during pregnancy, as an alternative to CT for patients with allergies to IV contrast material) and for follow-up studies. Furthermore, we consider MRI to be a promising diagnostic tool for screening active TB in selected populations.

It could be concluded that: There are no significant differences between HRCT and MRI in terms of identification of lung lesions in non AIDS patients with non milliary pulmonary tuberculosis.

2.- Manuscript

We really think it can be interesting to demonstrate if the findings on Chest-X-Ray add something or not to MRI in the follow-up of patients with TB. However we think it can not be concluded that based on the evidence produced in this study we believe that chest X-rays and MRI could be the most appropriate radiological procedures for managing pulmonary TB.
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