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Reviewer's report:

Abstract:
L.72: presumptive TB patients are written twice. Please, correct.

Background:

L.87 - typo: poses.

Results:

L.188: Table 1's title appears twice, here and on L.190. Better keep the title that appears on L.190.

Table 1: The percentages need revision. On the row for "Underwent Xpert MTB/RIF", what is the percent expressed as 94.1? If it is 48 out of 726, the result would be 6.6%, and if 48 out of 62, 77.4%. I suggest the second, in order to keep up with the other values, obtained from the row immediately above.

L.194: I would have this paragraph before the one that starts on L.178, as it has the totals that appear on Table 1. I had to search for those numbers while reading the table.

Comments:

The study provides a comprehensive approach of a public health problem dealing with private services in a low-middle income country, quite different from countries with huge public sector in a access for all context. The challenges and strategies presented here are helpful for those facing the same scenario.

I agree that the most important result is the uptake of tests by presumed patients, and in order to increase the uptake, a lot of "by-in" of providers, specifically physicians, will be needed, besides efforts to reduce costs for the patients and to increase their awareness of TB and DM interaction.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.

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.
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