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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript assesses which factors (patient and health system) are associated with excessively long treatment of TB patients in the eastern Paris region. The design of the survey seems to be appropriate to reach the objective. The recommendation in the conclusion part of the abstract ‘Better communication among practitioners managing a given patient….’ is not supported by the data provided in the results section. I therefore, suggest to delete this recommendation (or to provide the evidence that supports this recommendation).

Suggestions:

Introduction
The introduction refers to a study on the same subject also performed in France. It is not clear from the introduction why the current study is still needed/valuable if this study already existed.

Please inform the reader whether the French TB treatment guidelines are conform the WHO ones and if not where the deviate.

Methods
The authors mention that they excluded patients whose treatment period was not known. I did not find the number of patients that was excluded due to this reason in the first part of the results section.

The authors should mention how they measured socio economic status. Also I did not find the association of socio economic status and excessively long treatment in the results section.

The authors used the student’s t test for continuous variables. This can only be done if the variables have a normal distribution. I did not find information regarding this in the paper.

Discussion
The sentence ‘Infectious diseases specialists are usually aware of published data on HIV sero positive patients’ is not clear. What data on HIV sero positive patients? This sentence also seems to contradict with the sentence that starts with Indeed, a recent retrospective study.
It is unclear to me what the last section on page 7 has to do with excessive long treatment. I suggest deleting this.

On page 8 the authors introduce convalescence units and general practitioners. These have not been introduced before. Please also mention these in the methods and results section if they are important.

On page 9 the authors mention that patients managed in more than one health care structure may have been lost to follow up. According to the results section none of the eligible patients was lost to follow up (except for those who were not put on treatment). Therefore, I do not understand this statement.

Conclusion

How does monitoring the end of treatment have an effect on excessive long treatment? This part of the conclusion is not related to the manuscript. Please explain.

Tables

I suggest making one table of table 1, 3 and 4. Now table 4 is difficult to read because it does not contain numbers.
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