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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript has provided data on the state of implementation of infection control measures at facility level in one of the high TB burden countries in the world. They also point out the number of healthcare workers diagnosed as a hard metric to demonstrate the gravity of this problem. The authors should be commended for this work.

The paper is also well written and succinct.

The paper can however be improved by attending to the following comments

Major compulsory Revisions
1. The title should be edited to reflect what was actually done. The title talks of TB control measures which is a broader term than just TB infection control. It should say TB infection control measures.

This mix of terms should be edited throughout the abstract and entire manuscript.

2. It is also not clear which data was obtained from physical observation and interviews. This should be clarified.

3. A short description of the health facilities can help readers assess if these results apply to their facilities. This should be added.

4. Data analysis was based on present or absent of measures. Is there a critical level below which transmission is highest. It would not be practical to expect that facilities would comply with all recommendations. This analysis of critical absences should be done even if not quantitatively to enrich the discussions.

5. The return of questionnaires was very low. If physical visits were made; would it have been possible to follow up on non respondents. A minimal data table should be added to compare at minimum a few demographics such as age, cadre of respondents and non respondents. Even those who responded could not disclose age, responsibilities. This points to something serious about how front line health care workers view infection control activities They could have misinterpreted the study as a policing exercise. It should be further explored and discussed.

6. Figure 1 adds little to the report. Consider removing.

7. The numbers of health care who have been diagnosed with TB is given. But the time is not given. Is it one year, two etc. This should be clarified.
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