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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
1. The title is not in full accordance with the contents. The title uses the words “screening of immigrants”. However, it seems that the screening at VICO was a mixture of immigrant screening and screening for other purposes e.g. contact tracing, health workers returning from high incidence countries; and the largest group screened at VICO was Norwegian (page 6 paragraph 3). We think that either the title must be changed, or the paper must be rewritten and Norwegians removed from the study population.

2. The tables, particularly Table 1, must be improved, e.g.:
   - Table 1, 4th row, “Place of registration” should probably be on 3rd row
   - The words “Municipality” and “Hospital” in 4th row, columns 3-6 do not make sense to us
   - 8th row; Mantoux >15 mm needs to be explained. Norwegian guidelines state that Mantoux 6 mm or more is considered to be positive
   - We assume that the numbers following the percentages are confidence intervals, but that should be made clear
   - A confidence interval for a percentage cannot be negative (11th row, 5th column and 12th row, three last columns), replace negative values with 0. In Table 2, 6th row last column: CI cannot exceed 100.
   - Consider changing the denominator for calculating the proportions in the two last rows to those with latent TB only.

3. The language must be improved. There are numerous grammatical and other mistakes. The authors should seek assistance from a person who is proficient in English.

Minor essential revisions
4. In page 3, 3rd paragraph it is stated that asylum seekers are screened on arrival in Oslo. In page 4 it is stated that the RHC does TB screening for asylum seekers. Is any primary screening of asylum seekers taking place in Trondheim, or do the authors mean follow-up of asylum seekers? That needs to be clarified.

5. A positive Mantoux test (page 3, 3rd paragraph) should be defined, see also previous remark to Table 1.
6. Page 3, Approvals and permissions, 3rd line: approved by whom?

7. Discussion, 2nd paragraph. Something seems to be missing in the first line, perhaps “Attendance at” or “Adherence to”.

8. Page 8, 2nd paragraph. There is probably a spelling mistake in the last sentence, perhaps “then” should be replaced with “than”.

9. The references are incomplete, e.g. reference no 1, 4, 5 and 11.

Discretionary revisions

10. The main focus of the paper is on the interface between primary and specialist health care services. However, it would be of interest if the authors could include some information about waiting time (if any) for the screening at VICO and RHC, respectively.

11. Page 7, last paragraph and last line: We think it is better to write p<0.001 than p<0.000
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**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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