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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors evaluate three commercial kits that are available to detect the MPB64 antigens specifically produced by M. tuberculosis complex by lateral immunochromatography. Independent and comparative validation experiences of these diagnostics are opportune to gather sound data on their performance. The contribution of this article is worthy because: i) a wide range of mycobacterial species and subspecies were tested, to assess specificity, ii) mpt64 geni and RD loci were investigated, iii) results obtained with kits produced by 3 companies were compared and iv) the discussion is very informative.

The experience is well designed and the manuscript well presented.

Minor essential revision

It is advised to consider the following suggestions and corrections

**Title**

The title does not describe the comparative evaluation performed with kits produced by different companies which is a valuable feature of this study

**Abstract**

To precise the conditions under which the kits were evaluated, it would be convenient to clarify that the clinical isolates were retrieved from a collection and subcultured. Challenges might be somewhat different when testing isolates obtained in liquid media directly from clinical specimens and immediately after being flagged as positive.

It is of interest to compare the results obtained with other kits (i.e. SD MPT64 and TBcID):

Line 71. Brands other than Capilia are available and being adopted

Line 83-96 Mycobacterium species or subspecies were tested

Lines 43, 45, 154, 199. Revise wording

Lines 265-270 It is suggested to declare if the authors have conflict of interests in relation to any of the kits evaluated

Some recent publications evaluating Capilia TB-Neo are not presented nor
discussed
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