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Reviewer's report:

The authors responded well to the comments raised by the reviewer. However, there are still several methodological issues in this manuscript that should be resolved:

- A revision of the English language is necessary, especially for the text that has been revised.
- The title should specify that this SR and MA is about "prevalence" of tuberculosis.
- It is not clear why some terms in the search strategy are written in italic.
- Still regarding this search strategy, authors simply wrote terms that they used. A complete search strategy should be included for at least one of the databases used.
- Please change the sentence "hand search was also done from identified articles" by "the bibliographies of relevant articles were also hand searched".
- The quality assessment of studies is not clear at all. 1) Please describe the quality assessment tool used in the methodology. 2) Authors decided to exclude from the MA studies having 50% and above quality score -what is the rational for this choice? Is this a valid tool with specific cut-offs reported in the literature? Moreover, the results were not reported in the results part. Please specify that all studies had a quality score above 0.5 and therefore, none of these studies were excluded. 3) A better way to deal with quality is to perform subgroup analyses based on the median quality score of studies. All of the above raised points should be specified and discussed.
- In the data analysis part, please remove "results were presented following PRISMA reporting guidelines". It has already been said in the beginning of methods and this sentence is wrongly placed.
- All definitions should be placed prior to the paragraph about statistical analyses.
- In the results, data about subgroup analyses are not clear. What is the p-value (p<0.001) about? Moreover, heterogeneity is still present in these subgroup analyses. Authors should think about other subgroup analyses in order to identify the source of heterogeneity. It is
also not clear why authors decided to remove all other subgroup analyses from the manuscript (Table 3).

- Authors should present more detailed results about sensitivity analyses and discuss about that in the discussion section.
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