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Reviewer's report:

The authors describe an intervention in MCH and FP clinics in Dar Es Salaam. From the manuscript it is not clear what the objective is.

1) Assess prevalence of pulmonary TB among women attending Family Planning and Maternal and Child Clinics (title)

2) Determine the contribution of screening for TB all women with cough attending FM and MCJ clinic (abstract)

3) To explore the possibility of screening all women attending FP and MCH clinics for TB (background)

This makes it very difficult to assess whether the methods used are appropriate.

Below I answer the questions posed by Biomed Central.

1) Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

In the background section the authors indicate that their objective is to explore the possibility of screening women attending FP en MCH clinics for TB. The objective described in the abstract is different. There the authors write that they want to determine the contribution of screening for TB all women with cough.

The authors should resolve this inconsistency and make the conclusion related to the objective.

2) Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The methods focus on measuring part of the information that is needed to assess whether it is possible to screen women attending FP and MCH clinics. Information that is not measured and that should be measured in my opinion to assess the feasibility of screening women attending FP and MCH clinics for TB is:

- Number of women that were screened by the study clinicians
- Number of women that were not screened by the study clinicians and why
- Number of women that refused to participate in the study
- Number of women that provided one, two or three sputum samples
- Number of women that returned to collect the result of the sputum examination

In the methods section the authors mention that they 'enrolled all women'. How
was this ensured?
And was a woman only included once or could she be included several times if she visited the clinic several times. If she can only be included once, how was this ensured?

It is not possible for the reader to repeat the sample size calculation since only the assumed prevalence of pulmonary tuberculosis was given. Please also provide the other assumptions. And did the authors take into account for the sample size calculation that they are likely to have a certain percentage of women with incomplete information?

Why did the authors do the sample size calculation for pulmonary tuberculosis whereas they measure smear positive pulmonary tuberculosis. This is not correct!

The sample size calculation should be performed to ensure that you are able to obtain sufficient information to be able to reach the main objective. Since the main objective is not clear I do not know whether this samples size calculation is appropriate.

The authors should provide the definition of when a sputum smear is considered positive for acid fast bacilli? Also scanty?

The authors should provide the exact ages that are considered to belong to the reproductive age group.

3. Are the data sound?
As far as can be assessed the data that are presented are sound.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
In general yes but not everywhere in the manuscript. E.g. in the results section the authors provide a lot of decimals for percentages (95% CI 27.228-27.979). I would say one decimal is more than enough. Also in Table 1 they provide the percentages in different age groups and education level in the notes. Also this I find rather unusual.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
In general the discussion is well balanced.
The conclusion is not related to the objective stated in the background section. Also the data do not support the conclusion. Most likely the women are detected earlier with TB due to the screening at the MCH and FP clinics. It is not proven by this study that the intervention leads to increases in TB notification.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
One limitation of the study is stated.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building,
both published and unpublished?
The authors refer to comparable work done by others.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No. The title suggests that the authors aim at assessing the prevalence of pulmonary TB among women attending MCH and FP clinics, this is not the objective stated in the background section. As already reported above the objectives stated in the abstract is different from the objective mentioned in the background section.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
In general yes.

Background row 14: intervention should be interventions.
Discussion row 8: increase in TB/HIV co-infection
Discussion row 23: government hospital attendees
Table 1: Married should be married. I find the term couples not very clear. Suggest to use married or cohabiting vs single, divorced, or widow
Reference 1 and 2 are rather old. The 2008 report is available. I suggest to refer to that report.

What is the difference between reference 3 and 4?
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