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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.

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 ????.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 (italic)

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.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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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