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Reviewer's report:

Lumbani Makwakwa review

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes it is

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   To my understanding yes they have described them well

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   It does, except for the few corrections highlighted below and will require being proofread for spelling and grammar check

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes they are, additional comments below

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   They have been stated and have also explained ways to control them in the study such as checking patient medical cards to reduce recall bias.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes, however I suggest they correct the format of the references to conform to BMC format as in example given below.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes, it will require a few corrections and grammar check before publishing.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
• In line 60 the sentence is written in past tense
• Line 69 & 70. Please give the percentages for case detection rate and incidence of MDR-TB in Uzbekistan and reference
• Line 90, 91; The period stated earlier is August 2013 to January 2014 and not January 2013 to January 2014
• Line 174 delete “have”
• Line 189; should rather be “first visit to health facilities”
• Line 193; delete “than”
• Provide separate headings for patient delay and health system delay under results so they can easily be followed
• Line 205 should rather read, “first visit to a private facility”
• Line 225 similar to line 205 should start with “first visit to ….”
• Line 247 should insert ‘health’ system delay
• Consider revising sentence in line 253
• Suggest a reason why non-smokers were more likely to have longer patient delay since this was unlike most findings.
• In line 269 insert “on” between influences and our

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The references need to comply with BMC requirements such as;

Instead of


**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

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