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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Response to Editor and Reviewer comments

Response to the Editor:

Before acceptance, we would urge you to further improve the manuscript in response to the comments made by the reviewers. We would also request that you go through the manuscript formatting checklist one more time and ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to all of the points. The link to the formatting checklist is provided at http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals

- Response: Below kindly find a point by point response to both reviewers. Additionally, we have taken care to go through the manuscript formatting checklist and our revised manuscript conforms to all of the points.

Response to Reviewer 1:

Reviewer: Ruwen Jou
Reviewer's report: Authors have made substantial changes to improve the clarity of the manuscript.

Minor comments:
Please use “drug susceptibility testing” throughout the text.
- Response: This has been done

In Abstract
Line 1. Please use “tuberculosis (TB)” to replace TB.
- Response: This has been done in line 1 of the abstract.

In Background
In page 5. Please clearly define the “busy” laboratory. Is that a reference lab?
- Response: This is a TB reference diagnostic laboratory. This has now been made clear on page 5 of the revised manuscript.

In Results
In TAT, in page 14. Please describe the results for the 1+ specimens.
- Response: There was only one, 1+ specimen that was analyzable, and the direct BACTEC result for that was 6 days. This has been indicated on page 15 of the revised manuscript.

In Discussion
In pages 15 and 16. Authors used R for rifampicin and S for streptomycin in the background section. To avoid confusion, please do not use R for resistant and S for susceptible.
- Response: This has been changed. We have now indicated “resistant” for R and “susceptible” for S.
In Tables
The Table 2b could be omitted. The data were already described in the results (page 13).
  •  Response: Table 2b has been deleted as advised, and the corresponding reference to the table in the text and legend to tables removed.

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
  •  Response: The English language has been reviewed and improved.

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests

Response to Reviewer 2:

Reviewer: Voahangy Rasolofo Razanamparany
Reviewer's report:
The authors answered to all questions and comments.

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.
  •  Response: We have the same view as the other reviewer that the manuscript is adequate without further statistical analysis.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.