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Reviewer's report:

Major Comments

Comment 1. Conclusion: The authors conclude that: our meta-analysis showed a significant benefit from CB DOT compared to clinic DOT for treatment success, but not difference between the two DOT strategies for loss to follow-up. The authors do not say anything about patients who failed treatment between the two groups. Examining the TB treatment outcomes, that includes treatment success (cured plus complete treatment), treatment failure and loss to follow. The authors’ findings indicate that since there was no difference in the loss to follow-up between the two treatment strategies (CB-DOT and Clinic-DOT), the differences in treatment successes between the two strategies may be explained by the treatment failures that occurred during treatment, which might indicate that the patient populations were different as far as sensitivity to treatment. Given that majority of the studies were observational, might this be related to the reason why patients were put on a given treatment strategy? Authors should explain why they think that CB-DOT was more effective than Clinic-DOT and not because the populations who received the interventions were different

Minor Comments

Comment 2. Abstract Key words: Instead of repeating directly observe therapy in words and also as an abbreviation DOT, the authors should add clinic-DOT as it is the other comparison arm

Comment 3. The question the reviewers are addressed was clearly stated Line 114, definitions, it should read CHWs were defined as not CHWs are were defined as written ..... 

Comment 4. Line 193 The primary outcome was the proportion of patients who successfully completed treatment .......... To avoid confusion with patients who completed treatment versus the composite of patient who completed treatment and those who cured I suggest that the authors rewrite the statement to read that: The primary outcome was the proportion of patients who were successfully treated and the secondary outcome .......... 

Comment 5. The methods are well described and they are appropriate given the study question the authors set out to answer.
Comment 6. Figures should be titled

**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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