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Reviewer's report:

Nice manuscript that adds further evidence to the data on successes in scale up of TB/HIV activities via TB programs.

Minor essential revisions: The content of the manuscript describes the scale up of collaborative TB/HIV activities from the NTP entry point. The title refers to TB/HIV activities writ large. The authors should clarify in the title and text that this article excludes consideration of the HIV entry level activities, namely the Three Is.

The authors should make clearer that they are measuring scale-up vis-a-vis their 2005 evaluation compared to nationally reported scale-up program data. It would be useful for them to comment on the quality and completeness of those data as the basis for comparison.

Please clarify how TB services are organized in Rwanda. Mention is made of 'TB clinics' and 'PHC' clinics. Are TB services standalone or integrated and how does this impact on referral and the rate of successful linkages to HIV care, prior to the adoption of the one-stop model?

Similar to above, how are HIV assessment and treatment services organized, eg how does the the decentralized TB network map to HIV services and what impact does that have on follow-up?

The Rwanda experience offers good lessons to other countries for scale-up yet these are not explored in this paper. Could the authors include some background on the Rwanda policies and how they were operationalized?

Abstract discussion first sentence: change "access... were" to "was."

Discussion, third paragraph. Reference is made to the dilemma of poor recording and reporting versus real changes in service delivery. An examination of these aspects would inform the selected measures to implement according to cause. It is stated that it is not possible to determine the amount of change attributable to these which is correct. However, is such an examination part of the NTP's programmatic evaluation?

Discussion, last paragraph: use of term 'contradicted' seems semantically awkward. Rather..."refuted" or "proved unjustified"?
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

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