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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

1. This systematic review has been conducted applying standard tools. The manuscript is very well written and discussed including suggestions on what further studies need to be done in the specific subject.

2. Only a few minor suggestions are given. It may be stated that exclusion of studies published in non-English language is not expected to significantly alter the conclusions of this review, due to their small numbers.

3. Line 154: ‘age’ may be replaced by ‘age-group’.

4. Line 241 states that reference standard included ‘culture of sputum’. In the corresponding figure 2, it is ‘different sample type’. I feel the same expression may be used in the figure as in the text.

5. Line 280: after ‘figure 5’, ‘table 2’ may also be typed

6. Line 275 is about diagnostic accuracy but there is no mention of specificity under this sub-head or in table 2. Authors may state the reason for not calculating pooled specificity for smear positive and smear negative samples.

7. Line 401-402: reference may be given

8. Line 454 states that urine based diagnosis is useful but the number of studies is just 2 and that too demonstrate low sensitivity.

9. Line 463 implies that high sensitivity was found in the study referenced at no. 52. It may be stated why this study was not included for the present review.

10. Minor language corrections
    - Line 317: replace ‘it’ with ‘its’
    - Line 492: delete ‘a’ before ‘clearly,
    - Line 494: delete ‘a’ before ‘different’

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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