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Reviewer's report:

Report of the article:
Tuberculosis contact tracing: effectiveness of community health workers in a city with massive recent immigration.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
In general yes, but in my opinion it is necessary that the authors give to the readers: a) some characteristics of the hospital that they mention (A, B, C, D, E). It is necessary to give an idea that contribute to understand the differences between hospitals B and D with respect to the rest; b) What mechanisms did they used to validity the information about contact tracing done, by the community health workers.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, but it is necessary that the authors specify the reasons of the following sentence (page 9, paragraph 3): “One study limitation was the variation in characteristics between both periods; an increase of cases between 25-39 years of age, from Latin America and India, Pakistan and from inner-city in the CHW group. We believe that these differences didn't affect the results…” Why not?

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Please, see the previous comment.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title, yes. The results section is a little confused. It is because it is not clear what hospital B or D means.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
I think yes, but I am not English native speaker.

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories: MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Reviewers are asked to note whether they think duplication or plagiarism has occurred.
Answer: In my opinion, in this case there is not duplication or plagiarism.

Reviewers should also let the journal know if they believe that research has been falsified or manipulated,
Answer: No, I do not think so.

or if there are issues with the authorship or contributions towards the manuscript, such as the unacknowledged involvement of a medical writer.
Answer: No, I do not think so.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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