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Reviewer's report:

Re: 'Factors associated with patient and health care system delay in diagnosis for tuberculosis in the province of Luanda, Angola'

Luigi Segagni Lusignani, Gianluca Quaglio, Andrea Atzori, Joseph Nsuka, Giovanni Putoto, Maria Da Conceiçao Palma, Ross Grainger and Fabio Manenti
BMC Infectious Diseases Research article

The authors have met all the requirements indicated by points 1 – 9 below:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
9. Is the writing acceptable?

In my opinion there are no serious deficiencies in this work.

This work investigates the factors associated with delays to diagnosis of TB in the specific setting of Luanda, Angola. It is important to do this as such delays contribute to the ongoing transmission of TB and identifying the more significant factors can inform policies that will reduce these delays.

Conclusion section: Although the authors briefly summarise the important factors it might be helpful to the reader if these were listed in point form, in descending order of importance. Possibly they could suggest ways to address these factors.

Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)
1. Abstract: Methods – line 1 remove repeated ‘a’

2. Abstract: Results – lines 4 and 7 seem to repeat ‘centre of the first contact’ but have different data.

3. Introduction: spelling of heading


5. Materials: Study design – paragraph 1 line 9: ‘weakness’ not ‘wealness’


7. Survey instrument: paragraph 1 - line 4 before end: ‘patient’.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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