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Dear Editorial Committee,

This is a final note of thanks and appreciation for favourable peer-review of our manuscript mentioned above. We are sure that this manuscript will incite an interesting debate or discussion about this interesting topic “delayed diagnosis of tuberculosis”. We have provided the final improvements to the manuscript as suggested by Alan Altraja in this final version of the Manuscript submitted. Responses to reviewers’ comments are provided below.

Looking forward to publishing our research with BioMed Central group journals in future as well.

On behalf of all authors

Chandrashekhar T Sreeramareddy

Reviewer: Alan Altraja

Reviewer's report:
The manuscript "Time Delays in Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis: A Systematic Review of Literature" by Chandrashekhar T Sreeramareddy et al. has been substantially revised with providing additional data and data analysis. Some revisions still remain to be completed:

1. On page 7, 1st paragraph, second last sentence: "This was not different when analysed separately for LMICs and HICs." : please provide p value.

   P-value was calculated and provided in the manuscript.

2. On page 7, 2nd paragraph: just omit last sentence in this paragraph, but just give p-value and reference to figure 3a.

   As suggested the sentence was deleted from the manuscript as authors also felt that it was not necessary.

3. Figure 2 (flow chart of inclusion of papers into the analysis): from box 5 ("360 studies...") just draw arrow to the right and add an additional box to indicate the fate of the 262 studies that were not included. This makes the figure more Self-explanatory and eliminates the need for referral to the text.

   The suggested additional box included in the flow chart showing what types of studies/reports (262) were excluded.
Reviewer: Joseph Beyene
Reviewer’s report:
The authors have addressed the shortcomings that I had criticized in my earlier report. In their cover letter, they have clearly described the revision they have carried out. I therefore think that their paper can now be accepted for publication.

Thank you for your contributions as peer reviewers to improve the scientific rigor and intellectual content of our manuscript.

On behalf of all the authors

Dr. Chandrashekhar T Sreeramareddy