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Reviewer's report:

In general this is a real life project that could have been repeated other places and this makes it interesting. But to get a better understanding about how the project was performed, some more information on certain topics is needed.

Major compulsory revisions

Introduction

1: Why did you choose verbal screening? Could you mention some more previous research (more than one), also make some references on why exactly these questions were asked. (See also line 82-83)

Methods

2: Line 86: individuals--were referred; but how much information did they get, did they have to pay for costs, have a free ride to the clinic, --. Please give a more extensive explanation how this was done.

3: Line 100-101: printed leaflets in 11 languages: were these leaflets read to the patients or did they read the leaflets themselves?

4: Were the interviews read to them by translators in each (11 different) language?

Results

5: In methods line 75: “all individuals were considered for inclusion”, but in results line—117 “We enrolled 2142” - but how many were considered for inclusion altogether?

Discussion

6: Line 165: what was done to find those patients that did not appear for further examinations? This is a crucial step in this kind of screening. Discuss what could be done-

7: Line 177 “additional strategies are needed” additional to what? What has been done already to stimulate the patients to do further examinations?

Minor essential revision

8: Line 208: do you think repeated symptom screening could work as health education for a susceptible population, thus increase awareness of TB symptoms and increase the likeliness of patients seeking care for TB?

Discretional revision
9:Line 195: “that a rule based on the presence of at least“ ad “of”
10:Line92: no sputum: did everybody have and induced sputum or bronchoscopy or was this up to the physician?
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