Reviewer's report

Title: Explaining patient delay in healthcare seeking and loss to diagnostic follow-up among patients with presumptive tuberculosis in Tanzania: A mixed-methods study

Version: 0 Date: 07 Dec 2018

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This study is an output from a larger trial done among TB suspects recruited from pharmacies. This study stands out among the other literature in this field of research being a mixed-methods design, and using prominence score get the information about patient-reported causes of symptoms and healthcare behavior. The writing and article structure and statistical analyses and presentation are very lucid and comprehensible.

Overall very impressed with the study and recommend that this information be available to wider readers as print.
REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I have only a few minor suggestions

1) Title may indicate mixed methods design

2) Abstract and main paper lines (58-59 and 301-302) "Among the 50 (36.8%) non-LDFU, 26 (52.0%) had also delayed seeking care ". Let both numerators and denominator be given with % to clear how many out of how many so on.

3) Line 239 -258, All this information on variables operationalisation may be written under variables itself.

4) another limitation that all factors that could lead to patient delay of LDFU may be other factors not assessed in this study. Add a note on wider 95% Cis for some odds ratios.

5) Authors may add the univariate results from appendix into the tables 4 and 5, usually univariate and multivariate are reported together to compare how the factors associated with outcome changed when multivariate was done.

6) Authors back up their numerical results with support from a qualitative component. Methods do not adequately explain, how the data was collected for their results, though I read a section on analyses.

7) If they want to acknowledge this study as mixed methods study they should have separate sub heads under methods and results sections.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

no

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
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.

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.

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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