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Author's response to reviews: see over
In response to the reviewer’s comments, the authors have made the following changes, highlighted in red:

**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Pan-London Tuberculosis Services: A Service Evaluation  
**Version:** 1  
**Date:** 29 October 2011  
**Reviewer:** Fatima Bajwa

**Reviewer's report:**

The article in review is an Evaluation of TB Services and Delivery in London. It's a well-defined Research question covering almost all the areas related to TB Research. With some minor changes this would provide a base to further develop a Strategic plan to deal with TB Nurses. This time the minor changes have been addressed properly.

As far as the Methods are concerned, this time each methodology has been dealt with in great detail. The first paragraph in the Network Coordination section has been well described this time.

The leadership Challenges in the leadership and Management Section are in a more elaborate form this time. The section on inadequate staffing and support is revised well.

Data is reasonable. In Skill mix Requirement section the 5 areas of Skills are very adequately defined.

Discussion and Conclusion is elaborate and conclusive. The study has not described any Limitations. **Study limitations now form a separate sub-section of the Discussion section on p33.**

In acknowledgements section there isn’t any data or work mentioned upon which the authors could further build on. **Further research is highlighted in a new paragraph on p33 immediately before the Limitations section.**

Title and abstract convey the message very rightly this time.

**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Pan-London Tuberculosis Services: A Service Evaluation  
**Version:** 1  
**Date:** 16 January 2012  
**Reviewer:** Marie-Laurence L Lambert

**Reviewer's report:**

• The issue – how to improve TB services delivery in a large Western city – is definitely important. The article is however specific to London, and not easy to understand for somebody not familiar with specific health services organization in the UK. Findings, conclusions and recommendations have local relevance. Unfortunately they are not analyzed and presented in a way that could have
relevance for a readership less interested in London than in what they could learn for their own context. The article is long, and looks more like a report than a research article. Broader relevance of the study outside London and to a non-London audience is now addressed in the Abstract (p2), Background section (p5), Discussion (p32), Conclusions/Recommendations (p34).

• Methods: documentary analysis: search strategy not defined, inclusion criteria (“met only for 17/86 documents”) are not defined. Documentary analysis search strategy and inclusion criteria are now described in the Methods section (p6). Semi-structured interviews and focus group: it is unclear how participants were selected. Participant selection for interviews and focus groups is now described in greater detail in the Methods section (p7).

There were no interviews with patients. The reviewer states incorrectly that there were no interviews with patients. In this paper we refer to patients as service users, previously stating in the Introduction that interviews with service users were conducted, but that findings are presented in a separate paper. However, to reduce any unintended confusion this is now stated at the end of the first paragraph of the Methods section, (p6) and reiterated at the end of the first paragraph in the Semi structured interviews and focus groups’ section (p7), which details the selection of healthcare professionals and managers for interview.

In conclusion, this article has relevance for London, but no broader relevance, and we do not recommend it for publication in BMC public health. We advise the authors to seek publication in a paper with national focus. The paper would be better if shortened, but with more precise recommendations. For instance they could provide some hints of what “alternative service models” could be Broader relevance of the study outside London and to a non-London audience is now addressed in the Abstract (p2), Background section (p5), Discussion (p32), Conclusions/Recommendations (p34).
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