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Reviewer's report:

Minor Compulsory Revision.

1. Abstract, Methodology, the authors need to mention what happened to the other two isolates so that the number mentioned on line 19 and lane 25 may be understood.

2. Line 32, should read "The prevalence of MDR-TB did not show any significant increment compared........"

Background

1. Line 59, "Patterns" should have a small letter "p".

Page 3 Methodology.

Line 73, the sentence should read "The participants of this prevalence study were.....".

Page 3, Spatial distribution selected kebele, The authors talk of the required sample size for the prevalence survey and yet, there is nowhere where they talked about sample collection, decontamination, culture and identification.

2. I did not see the figure 1 refered to on the spatial distribution of selected kebele.

Page 4, Laboratory Tests.

1. Did the author perform laboratory tests on the isolates that were stored? If so, who performed isolation and identification. There is a lot of information that is lacking in the methodology. If the part of isolation and identification was published, then there should be a reference to that publication. If not, then in the Methodology, the authors should tell us which method they used to isolate and identify the organisms.

Page 4, line 105, subheading "Drug Susceptibility testing using......" should come before the Molecular characterization of the isolates.

Page 5.

Background characteristics.

There should be a reference for this section if the information was obtained from
somewhere, if its the authors’ information, then its methodology is needed.

The molecular characterization of isolates using spoligotyping can also give species. In the Deletion typing, isolates were either identified as M. tuberculosis or M. canetti. However, nothing has been said in the spoligotyping on the identity of the organisms. Did spoligotyping not identify the isolates?

Page 7, Discussion.

1. Line 171, were there any reports on the prevalence of M. bovis from those rural and pastoralist areas?

2. Line 171, The authors identified the organisms as M. tuberculosis or M. canetti, however, in the discussion they talk of M. tuberculosis only, where is M. canetti?

3. Line 175 and 176, M. bovis should be written correctly.

4. Page 8, line 177, M. tuberculosis should be in italics.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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