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General considerations

This article addresses an interesting topic such as extrapulmonary tuberculosis (EPTB) and its treatment outcome in a littoral region in Cameroon. It is now more evident the originality of the manuscripts and the value that can bring to the national TB policy in the Country.

I thank the authors for answering extensively to my comments in Round 1 and for being working hard to improve quality and the clarity of the article.

There are still several orthographic errors (space among words, capital letters, punctuation, English grammar and editing issues that the author need to address (for example, in abstract section, method: “confirmed EPTB cases were administer...” instead of “administered with”).

Comments

Abstract section:

1) “Confirmed EPTB cases were administer anti-tuberculosis treatment following the national tuberculosis guide.” In the background of the abstract, few lines above, you wrote “There is no national guideline on EPTB diagnosis and management in Cameroon”. This is contradictory. Please arrange consequently.

Discussion and conclusion:

1) Line 3, second page of Discussion

“Therapeutic success of EPTB is good and almost attending the 85% WHO recommendation for pulmonary TB.” There is no sense in my opinion to compare therapeutic success of EPTB with
the one recommend by WHO for PTB. 85% is a number specifically calculated for epidemiological TB control and does not fit EPTB forms.

It is more interesting to give better explanation of this therapeutic success (% treatment completed, ..etc) and to underline that one possible explanation is the fact that “we assigned a staff to call our patients very regularly to ensure that they all complied to their treatment even when they no longer felt sick” and may be that this is not always feasible in real life setting.

2) Line 12 second page of Discussion “All the patients who died in this study were HIV positively co-infected, but the numbers were too small for a proper analysis”. Still there is no mention to the HIV/TB factors that can affect the treatment outcome such as late diagnosis? HIV/AIDS late presenter? Any information about CD4 cell count, CPT HAART therapy

3) The fact that “Littoral region harbors many referral diagnostic and treatment institutions that pulls many persons from the regions in search for better health service” could have a role in the high percentage of TB/HIV co-infection? Do you think is worthwhile to mention this referral bias?

Conclusion

Line 22: see above: I do not think is correct to measure and compare EPTB treatment outcome with PTB treatment outcome. I would put more emphasis on the advantage of using new diagnostic tool that improve sensitivity to a challenging diagnosis such as EPTB.
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