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Reviewer's report:

Male Gender is Independently Associated with Pulmonary Tuberculosis among sputum and non-sputum producers Suspects in Southwestern Uganda

yap JB Boum II, Daniel Atwine, Patrick Orikiriza, justus assimwe, Anne-Laure Page, Juliet Mwanga Amumpaire and Maryline Bonnet

General
This is a well written manuscript. Requires mostly minor corrections, however, authors should still look through carefully and correct the grammatical errors and spacing after full stops.

Abstract
Background
1. Last sentence from Line 29 is quite confusing, please re-phrase

Conclusion
2. Line 45: diagnostic methods not diagnosis method

Introduction
3. The reference given for male, female reference ratio (2003) in the first sentence is old and more resent reference/references should be given. The next sentence should also be referenced.

4. Line 84: Write out the full meaning of PWPTB.

Methods
5. Line 97: Change “is” for “if” in the sentence on that line

6. Under study procedures, scoring of chest x-ray is confusing and should be re-written.

7. Last line of 2nd paragraph under the same heading, authors should state from whom the samples were collected.

8. The first sentence under Statistical analysis is confusing. The authors are summarizing by gender and comparing this between males and females.

9. Line 135 should be “Univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis were performed” at is performed.

Results
10. Line 153: The sputum producers and the non-sputum producers should be enrolled for and not from the studies.

11. Line 172: “……70 (10.4%) had culture positive results for TB and 41 (58.6%) were males” I think reads better.

12. Same line, authors should state who the smear-negatives and culture-positives are.

Discussion

13. First sentence should read Male TB suspects…………..

14. Line 193: Review the sentence also note that there were no results in the manuscript which showed that use of solid and liquid culture media gave better or high sensitive results.

15. Lines 198 and 211: Wrong referencing for Lawson et al. which means you should look through all your references.

16. Lines 207 to 213 should be re-written as it is very confusing

17. Check and re-write first sentence of the next paragraph (line214) so it can be better understood.

18. Line 222: should be “late” and not “later” presentation to………..

19. Line 234: should be “Secondly” and not “Second”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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