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Reviewer's report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions

   o Methods

   # Definition and classification:
   “The following international definitions are applied: [2, 3, 5] 1) smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis (PTB+) - acid-fast bacillary (AFB) found in at least two sputum specimens”

   R/ The current WHO recommendation is to have at least one sputum
   Would you like please to update your evidence.

   # Data collection
   “This was a retrospective cohort study”

   R/ The key features of a retrospective COHORT STUDY are not reported in your manuscript; for me this is rather a cross-sectional study. Please refer to the STROBE guidelines for reporting on observational study.

   # Statistical methods
   “multinomial Logistic regression models were used to investigate the effects of HIV testing…”

   R/ Your manuscript did not report the criteria to be found where Logistic regression is applied. There are guidelines for reporting Logistic regression in which the following criteria should/must be reported (see references below):

   # Analytic criteria: Sufficient events per variable, Conformity with linear gradient for, Tests for interactions, Collinearity, Validation, Statistical significance, Goodness-of-fit measures.

   # Documentation criteria: Selection of predictor variables, Coding of variables, Fitting procedure

   See the following references: Ottenbacher KJ, Ottenbacher HR, Tooth L, Ostir GV. A review of two journals found that articles using multivariable logistic


# References

Your referencing style is not consistent; which referencing style did you use, Vancouver, Harvard or any other. Please check accordingly especially where there are more than six authors.

# Finally and most important: I just found your recent publication in BNJ Open (see reference below) which is like a copy & past compared to this manuscript (Methods, Table 1). Apart from use of abbreviations instead of full word, it seems to me that this is a duplication of the same information/paper with “manipulation of data” i.e. the same method, same design, same study setting, same study period, same authors “could” have led to somewhat the same sample size. In addition you are even not able to acknowledge your own published paper anywhere in your current manuscript.

e.g.:

Methods: same sub-headings, same sentences and wording
Table 1: differ only by the total number (sample size) and the categorisation of age.

Unless a sound explanation in your manuscript, I think this is scientifically not acceptable.


2. Minor Essential Revisions

o Title page:
  # South African Medical research Council: change capital letter on Research

# Word count: Main test: change test with text

# Throughout the text: please be consistent with abbreviations, the paper is not easy to read. E.g.: ATT, DTC, CDT

o List of abbreviations:
  # AFB: acid-fast bacillary
  R/ Please change bacillary with bacilli

o Table 1: ETB, extra-pulmonary tuberculosis
  R/ Please replace ETB with EPTB for consistency (ref: your list of abbreviations)

o Table 3: Bottom (legend)
R/ Delete the second “LR, likelihood ratio”

- Figure 1: the title and legend of a figure should be at the bottom of the figure; please change for consistency.

3. Discretionary Revisions

- Figure: Will this figure be printed in color? otherwise please change colors for black/grey printing.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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