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Reviewer’s report:

This is a timely and useful summary of the current literature in this area and highlights the heterogeneity of research. Due to the different methodology of the studies it is difficult to draw broad conclusions regarding implementation of screening strategies. I would perhaps have spent less time discussing individual studies and more time reviewing the different assumptions made and different methodologies used in each study and highlighting the importance of this when reviewing studies (this is the strongest part of the paper in my opinion).

Major compulsory revisions

None

Minor essential revisions

The cost analysis for the Hardy et al paper is presented in pounds sterling in the text but euros in Table 1. The units of currency should be consistent in each section.

I feel it would be easier to review the data in Tables 1-2 if the papers were presented in the order in which they are discussed in the text.

In table 2, for the Oxlade study [23], for close contacts a No screening strategy should be included as this is discussed in the text.

The formatting for table 2 was incorrect in the pdf I received making interpretation of the data for the Marra study [22] difficult. This should be corrected for the final proof.

In table 2, for the Diel study [27] the result for the treatment cased QFT strategy reads “no non treatment dominant”. Should this read “non-treatment dominated”?

Discretionary revisions

I would include the section starting with the paragraph “The ultimate aim of LTBI screening…” in the “discussion” rather than the “results” section.

Figure 1 does not add an extra information or clarify any information which is not already discussed in the text. For this reason I would consider removing it.

Recommendation
Accept for publication with minor revisions
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