

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Care seeking in tuberculosis: Results from a countrywide cluster randomized survey in Bangladesh
AUTHORS	Hossain, Shahed; Zaman, K; Quaiyum, Abdul; Banu, Sayera; Husain, Ashaque; Islam, Akramul; Borgdorff, Martien; van Leth, Frank

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Mahfuza Rifat University of Newcastle, Australia And BRAC, Bangladesh
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Mar-2014

- The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.

REVIEWER	Dr. Md. Abdul Hamid salim Bangladesh
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Mar-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>1. Out of the 118 passively detected cases who first sought care from informal provider, 52(44.0%), 17(32.6%) and 5(29.4%) remained in the informal sector at second, third and fourth subsequent points of care . The denominator used in this sentence is not clear. 52 is 44% of 118 but 17 (32.6%)and 5 (29.4%) what is the denominator. The way it is written it sound like all these figure are from 118. please make it more clear.</p> <p>2. The paper stated that informal providers are not accepted by the NTP to engage in TB control activities. The NTP guideline (earlier version) clearly mentioned the role of non formal providers as such all implementing partners engaged huge number of village doctors and other non formal providers. Huge amount of Global Fund money also used to engage the non formal providers. This statement need to be modified as well.</p> <p>3. The paper stated that care utilization from DOTS centres was mostly restricted to the cases belonging to higher socio economic position (SEP). Who are those acree seekers? need more clear explanations.</p> <p>Despite the clear findings of the strong presence of the informal health sector in Bangladesh, the NTP does not strongly embark on initiatives to engage these providers in TB=control activities . Same comment as of point 2.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Monde Muyoyeta ZAMBART Project
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Apr-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>1. The authors do not state if ethical approval was obtained for this study. Of concern is the fact that patients (the control population) details were obtained from treatment registers and used to follow them up from their homes. The authors need to state clearly that they had ethics approval to do this.</p> <p>2. The authors need to pay attention to sentence construction. A number of errors are observed, for example: page 5 line 11, and line 16 page 6 line 40 "only" should be deleted page 8 line 43 "through" replace with thorough" page 9 line 28 "on set" seems misplaced here page 14 line 11 active replaced with actively page 15 line 9/10 check sentence construction page 17 line 5 form replace with from</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 2: The denominators for the figures are clarified in the abstract. The NTP's view point on the involvement of private sector providers is rewritten in pages 6 and 17 and the inequity in care seeking by SEP is also further clarified in pages 6-7.

Reviewer 3: The Ethics approval was earlier given outside the text after acknowledgement section. However, now we have clarified this in a statement in page no 9 within methods and materials section. Other corrections and changes are made as per the reviewer's suggestions in the respective pages.

In response to your letter dated April 21, 2014, now I have deleted the previous figures and uploaded new ones. I hope these will meet your specification.