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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. On Abstract, should be improved for clarity how the study was realized.

2. The Introduction should be reformulated for clarity. There are some repetitive paragraphs.

3. On Introduction it is important to explain about External quality assessment (EQA) because EQA refers to a system of objectively checking laboratory results by means of an external agency. It includes comparison of a laboratory’s results at intervals with those of other laboratories. The main object is to establish between-laboratory comparability.

4. In the section methods the author needs to give a reference of the methods that were used.

5. On Methods the author should be clear the table 1. There isn’t subtitles in table1.

6. On Methods the author should be clear about how and who corrects the theoretical knowledge and practical skills. Who is the person? Expertise in AFB microscopy? What professional was involved with correction? How many years of the experience to do this? Did they have a diploma? What is the kind of diploma? Graduation or other?. It should be specified.

7. On Methods there are not subtitles in table1.

8. On Methods, there isn’t a number of protocol of ethical committee .

9. On Results, the date used in study was by 2009, but in table 2 the author related 2011. It should be clarified.

10. On Results there are not subtitles in table 2.

11. On table 2, it is necessary to reformulate and improve this table, there is a confusion with title and table 2.

12. On table 3, 4, 5 it is necessary to reformulate and improve these tables, there is a confusion with title and table 3,4,5.

13. On Results, in my opinion, it is necessary to introduce a figure about the sequence of these data “Data on pre training evaluation have shown that the mean score of the trainees in the theoretical assessment was 61.75% with
minimum score of 20%, maximum score of 100%...

14. On Results, on table 3 and on table 4 the authors put the same title (?), I couldn't understand this, it is necessary to improve the tables.

15. The author needs to add a "Limitations" section

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. The style of article in tables, in figures and in titles should be reworded to standardize the article.
2. There are a lot of titles of tables in one page and the table in the other. This is a style problem.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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