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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been refined to became neat.
I agreed that the simple ICD programme among HIV+ showed feasibility and high yield in resource limited routine program condition.

However, as discussion points in the manuscript became more clear, I have two major concerns with the logics of the discussion.

1. "The lower proportion of smear positives amongst those screened in our study in our study may be explained by reliance on sputum smears alone":
   This paragraph is logically strange. It should be either "the lower proportion of TB among screened may be explained by reliance of sputum smear diagnosis alone" and/or "The lower proportion of smear positives amongst those screened in our study may be explained by the difference in screening methodology, reliance on interview alone without CXR, and/or screening criteria of symptom duration of two weeks or more. Many studies have proved that sensitivity of screening criteria of "chronic" symptoms to detect TB is limited.

2. Having the number of participants screened as a denominator is the right way. However, as the author discussed the lower rate of sputum submission among suspects could be one of major causes of lower observed prevalence of S+ TB among the participants.

   The issue is not "Using a denominator of sputums submitted from suspects (n = 172) would have produced a higher yield of 16%." It is "The key barrier in the pathway was that 63% of TB suspects did not return sputum specimens."

   In the discussion above, the author should consult an epidemiologist to discuss the imputation of missing values. "If those who missed sputum submission had a same chance of being positive as those submitted,.....

   It is very important unless the author has any counter evidence to show that "those who did not submitted sputum specimen might be less likely to have TB
than those submitted”.
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