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Title: Comparison of pulmonary and extrapulmonary tuberculosis in Nepal- a hospital-based retrospective study

Dear Editor,

Thank you for a speedy re-review of the manuscript. We are pleased to see the constructive suggestion to the revised version. We are hereby providing this cover letter explaining the changes made to the reviewers’ comments.

Please find here under our responses and changes made in the manuscript.

We look forward for favorable reconsideration of the manuscript.

Regards

On behalf of all the authors

Chandrashekhar T Sreeramareddy

Version: 3 Date: 2 November 2007
Reviewer: Philip Hill
Reviewer’s report:
General
That authors have considered all the points raised

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
The authors have misunderstood my HIV comments. To put it another way, they should do a separate anaylsis excluding those known to have HIV and check that their findings hold up. This could be mentioned in the discussion, if not reported in the results, to add strength to the findings.

Authors’ replies

We carried out a separate analysis excluding the HIV-positive cases and found no change to the results of multiple logistic regression analyses. This has been mentioned in the discussion.
On page 17 paragraph 2 “We carried out a logistic regression analysis excluding those cases which were HIV-positive. The results of our main logistic regression analyses did not change”. Was added in the discussion section of the manuscript.

Version: 3  Date: 5 November 2007
Reviewer: Veeranoot Nissapatorn
Reviewer’s report:
General
COMMENT TO THE AUTHORS
The overall manuscript is shown very much improvement. I would be happy to see that if the authors add two more points, particularly in the discussion.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Discussion
Page 15, paragraph 2, Since this is the first publication in your region regarding TB with risk factor. Therefore, it would be better if the authors highlight a little bit more about kind of health education, campaign of stop smoking or any law enforcement in Nepal which shows a significant public health concern.

Authors’ reply
The suggested change was made in the discussion. The following statement was added “Currently there are no health education campaigns or legislation regarding sales of cigarettes in Nepal. This is significant public health concern in view of tuberculosis control.”

Page 16, paragraph 2, Are there any suggestions from the actual situation in your hospital in dealing with these patients with chronic diseases, particularly like DM? e.g., patients have signs or symptoms consistent with TB then they should come for screening or they may have CXR once in six months/a year if they had history contact of TB or had previous TB or ????.

Authors’s reply
The suggested change was made in the discussion. The following statement was added “Therefore it is important to periodically screen the patients with chronic conditions like diabetes, those on immunosuppressive drugs/steroids for occurrence of tuberculosis.”

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
MINOR REVISION
1. Background
Page 4, Line 3: mycobacterium tuberculosis --> Mycobacterium tuberculosis

2. Methods
Study setting
Page 6, Line 4: 3, 80,000 --> please revise

3. Results
Page 10, The first paragraph, line 5: patents --> patients
It looks better if the authors can standardize either “table or figure” or “Table or Figure”

Page 23, Table 1
History of contact --> History of contact with TB patients
HIV positive --> Anti-HIV positive status or HIV positive patients
Add 0.99 in p-value column

4. Discussion
Page 14, 2nd paragraph, line 7-8, ‘ever smokers’ --> “ever smokers” and also on page 15, line 1.

Authors’ reply

All the suggested changes are made in the revised manuscript. We also found some other typos where were corrected during the process of revisions.