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Reviewer's report:

Re: 'Inter-rater agreement in the assessment of abnormal chest X-ray findings for tuberculosis between two Asian countries'
Shinsaku Sakurada, Nguyen TL Hang, Naoki Ishizuka, Emiko Toyota, Le D Hung, Pham T Chuc, Luu T Lien, Pham H Thuong, Pham TN Bich, Naoto Keicho and Nobuyuki Kobayashi BMC Infectious Diseases Research article

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes, the question posed by the authors is very clearly defined

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods are quite appropriate, they wanted to do interater agreement assessment and methodology chosen is quite acceptable

3. Are the data sound?
The data are quite sound; the have presented multiple comparisons that show the same trend using different methods of assessing CXRays

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes, the manuscript is well structured, the tables and figures are very clear

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes the discussions and conclusions are well balanced and supported by the data. It makes sense that a simpler approach and creating uniformity and understanding different issues and interpretations that might vary due to training backgrounds is quite useful

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The limitations are clearly stated

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
The authors have provided adequate references and clearly compared the simplified system they developed and the already published CRRS system of CXRay interpretation

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes they accurately convey the results

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes the writing is acceptable

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

There are minor inconsistencies to the 317 individuals with abnormal CXRays where active TB was not excluded at baseline.

The abstract: Methods make it clear 258 individuals were evaluated since their baseline CXR films didn’t exclude active TB

The Methods: The last paragraph of the Methods section has an error; it states “The CXR films analysed in this study were those in which active TB had not been radiographically excluded during the prevalence survey and were those taken during the second follow-up in 2006.

I think they meant to say the films analysed were both the baseline prevalence survey films (258) and follow up films (93); this is made clear in figure 2. I would suggest the authors make this minor correction for consistency and smooth flow of the article

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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