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Reviewer’s report:

Research on delay is a good idea and can have impact on services. In this paper some important issues in a research paper must be improved.

Abstract: Define delay. Improve language

Intro: Define delay. Write clear research question and clear objectives

Methods: Define delay. Define all cut offs used in logistic regression. Line 92: Sample size NOT for better outcome, for higher precision in estimate. P-value for significance is OK, but it is NOT for association with TB.

Results: Table 3 is incorrectly labelled table 2. Risk for previously treated OR 0.25 is stated as 3.6 times higher risk. This is wrong. Same error in discussion.

Table 1 OK

Table 2. Heading does not say what DELAY is.

Table 2. This should be table 3. Not surprising thos who had TB a second time had LESS risk of dalay. OR= 0.25, a quarter. You say in results and discussion that they have 3 times HIGHER.

References: Most articles are OK, but almost all other documents incomplete.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Unable to assess

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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