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Reviewer's report:

Childhood Tuberculosis and its treatment outcome in Ethiopia

The article addresses important areas of public health interest and clinical significance. Given that the study was based on retrospective review should indicate the trend over five years which could be used as a measure of the program implementation and patients care. However, there areas to be improved. The discussion part needs to be rewritten after revision.

Major revision

Introduction:
1. The introduction is briefly written and does not clearly justify why the study was done
2. Clinical, diagnostic and patient care challenges which could justify the need for review is missing

Methods:
3. Diagnostic and treatment deception is given. Otherwise there is no clear algorithm be it international or National on which the case finding was based.

Study design and data collection
4. It does not describe which facilities, how and why they were selected is not clearly shown
5. The exclusion criteria for hospitals, if at all excluded and their importance in the diagnostics of childhood TB is missing

Results
6. Page 5, last sentence described new cases, what about retreatment t cases?

Discussion
7. The paper does not describe the importance of parents in the adherence to treatment which is very important in childhood TB

References
8. The discussion is based on few studies and does not make thorough comparison
9. Mainly based on guidelines and needs to be more of published articles than guidelines which reflect the interest of the organizations.
Minor revision
1. page 3, third sentence under diagnosis and treatment should go to introduction and described better
2. page 5, 9th sentence describes unsatisfactory outcome which may be written as poor outcomes
3. under data processing and analysis: TB registration books should be TB Unit registers
4. page 6, line 3 – 5, the words like vast majority should be omitted
5. Page 6, line 7, Mann Whitney is not described under the methods and should be described and why?

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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