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I review this MS for the second time and it has improvement compared to the first submission. However, still there major issues that should be addressed. I put the detailed comment from the document using Yellow highlight and sticky notes. Below is my general comment

1. Avoid word collection: The author should focus on the message and use single words. For instance, the author use Median (IQR), Woreda (district)…. Thus, use one word only and don't collect words.
2. Define key words and use them subsequently to avoid the using the definition of that word every time. For example, define what do you mean 'patient delay' and use this word only rather than its definition
3. Paragraph structuring and language need improvement
4. Too many typographical errors

Method
The study subjects were not defined very well. The report of delay will good if dis aggregated by type of TB cases. Otherwise, the finding is not informative and difficult to identify gabs. For example, currently, triage and cough separation, spot-spot sample collection strategy are in place. Moreover, ZN and Gene Xpert are being used. Thus, most infectious cases can be diagnosed within 1 or 2 days. However, due to facility, experts and overlapping sign and symptoms with other diseases, PTB- and EPTB are delayed. Thus, unless separately treat these group of people, the delay data will be imprecise

Sample size and sampling
* The sample size calculation method is not clear. Make it clear

Results and discussion
These sections need major revision. The message is not clear and it is not to the point. The author should focus on the main objective (Patient delay, provider delay and total delay) and associated factors. Avoid unnecessary details and narration, wordy.

The messages are not well structured and organized

Tables are not informative

Conclusion

The conclusion is not focused and clear. Need Major revision!

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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