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Reviewer's report:

The data of the manuscript contribute with important information to the field, but need to be reviewed.

Abstract:

Replace the subtitle Objective to Background.

The smear is used to confirm PTB, but not in the text. To review.

The conclusion is different from the text. The accuracy of 63.9% is not high. To review.

Introduction

Line 84 - Abbreviate Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex – MTBC

Line 85 - Correct non-tuberculosis to non-tuberculous

Line 88 - Replace Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex to MTBC

Patient and methods

Line 124 - Write in full AFB

Line 129 - Replace Who were suspect of having active TB to patient to be evaluated for TB
Line 131 - Give more details about the pathological examination.

Line 143 - The third group was the patients excluded. Give more explanation.

Line 154 - Replace acid-fast bacilli to AFB

Line 157 - The reference 22 is not appropriate.

Line 162 - Correct MT to MTBC

Results

The Table 1 is confusing. Clarify.

On Microbiology - would be clear if culture positive was Only culture positive = 96 and Positive smear was Positive smear and culture = 20

Clarify in the text why 68 patients are in Microbiology if all patients showed a negative results?.

Clarify why the four positive cultures were on the clinical diagnosis, since the criteria for classify the patients clinically were to have negative culture?

Line 257 - use NTM abbreviated

Line 275 - Correct non-tuberculosis to non-tuberculous

Table 2. The numbers used to calculated the sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV should be clearly informed into text or Tables for the reader to easily identify them.
Discussion

The sensitivity of 50.75% for SAT-TB x 21.64% for culture is not well explained and justified. The presence of inhibitors of enzymatic amplification would give a lower sensitivity not higher.

List of abbreviations

Correct non tuberculosis
Correct MTB to MTBC

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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