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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded well to the earlier comments, and again are to be congratulated for their careful and informative analysis.

Two minor essential revisions:

1. Table 4, 5a and 5b still do not account for the cost of the "no screening" strategy. In table 4, the "cases prevented" row compares each intervention with no screening; I believe the cost element should do the same. As mentioned earlier, this will actually improve the cost-effectiveness of the various interventions.

2. ‘Additionally, no screening incurs downstream costs due to treatment of active TB cases; this amounts to £57,148 per 1000 contacts screened over the 2 year period of the model.’ [pp. 9-10] Suggest you drop the word "screened" after "contacts" in this sentence.
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