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Reviewer's report:

An interesting study about treatment outcome of TB patients in the Busan, south Korea.

1- In the abstract, the part of "results" is needed to rewrite. It is somewhat vague. For example: "notified as having TB twice or more", "being in quantile Q4 and Q5" ..... 

2- What's the meaning of: .... We used the raw data to determine the final treatment outcome. (P6L22)

3- Definition of "cure" is problematic: "who was smear or culture- negative in the last ......" (P6L44). As you said smear negative, culture positive case in the last month is grouped as cured case (I group him as failure).

4- Just 38.8% of pulmonary TB cases had positive smear results (P7-L56). It is lower than standard. Sensitivity of sputum smears for diagnosis of TB is about 60-70%. How do you interpret this finding. Does it mean high proportion of empirical therapy (not confirmed cases)?

5- As you said: 1021 cases were registered twice or more (p6L17)(P8L1; ...more than twice!). Did you exclude repeated cases? I didn't find that in the flowchart of study (Fig 1).

6- Definition of Failure is problematic. Please check again in WHO guidelines.

7- I prefer "sputum smear" in comparison to "sputum stain". It is just an advise.

8- Did you evaluate the relation between degree of sputum smear positivity (1+, 2+, 3+) and outcome?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Unable to assess

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

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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