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**Abstract**

"Overall, Xpert displayed high specificity but modest specificity across various samples in the diagnosis of pediatric EPTB in comparison with the composite reference standard".

Comment: 'Specificity' was mentioned twice in the sentence. Is the 'modest specificity' mistakenly written in place of 'modest sensitivity'?

**Introduction**

Xpert is thus far the only rapid assay for TB diagnosis currently recommended by World Health Organization (WHO).

Comment: Xpert is not the only rapid assay for diagnosis of TB. Other test like TB LAMP with less turnaround time is also recommended by WHO.

**Discussion**

"Per the 2013 WHO data, the pooled sensitivity and specificity of lymph node TB in children were 86% (95% CI 0.65-0.96) and 81%...."

Comment- As per.....

**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 am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

- Acceptable
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