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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
I think that the authors should clarify the followings points:
1. In some patients excluded from analysis the diagnosis of PTB was "clinically confirmed". How was the diagnosis reached?
2. In 72 patients the diagnosis was ruled out. The authors should describe the alternative diagnoses.
3. Of the 126 study patients, 54 were diagnosed as having active pulmonary TB. The alternative diagnoses in the non-TB group should be reported.
4. HRCT had a sensitivity greater than FOB and the rapid diagnosis was based on FOB or HRCT results. If treatment was started in all patients with a rapid diagnosis, the authors should specify how many patients on therapy did not have a confirmed diagnosis of TB.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Tree in bud appearance was linked to active pulmonary TB. Can the authors report the non-TB diagnoses in patients with tree in bud?
2. Can the authors specify how many patients had a bronchial vs a pulmonary transbronchial biopsy?

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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