

Authors' Response to Reviewers

Reviewers comment: This manuscript investigated outcomes of TB treatment and analyzed factors for unsuccessful TB outcomes in rural Nigeria. The manuscript is basically well written. Although this study has some limitations as authors stated in Discussion section, the findings are useful to improve TB treatment outcomes in area similar to rural Nigeria.

Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the kind comment, constructive criticisms and useful suggestions for which we have used to improve our manuscript. We have responded to other issues suggested by the reviewers line by line.

Reviewer's comment: I just give some suggestions below. Page 1. Title. Page 11, lines 9, 10. The description has inconsistency with Table 1 data. According to Table 1, 520 (47.3%) were treated using the 6-month regimen.

Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have identified the error and made the necessary corrections in the manuscript text.

Reviewer's comment: Page 11, line 16; Page 12, line 4 from bottom. Add a comma (,) before "respectively"

Author's response: We thank the reviewer for the suggestions. We have included the suggested changes.

Reviewer's comment: Tables 2, 3. Check the format of the figures and use only one page for each table if possible.

Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the comments. We retained the suggested fonts for manuscript submission. We believe that in the final published version of the paper Tables 2 and 3 will have a Table per page. In addition, according to the journal guidelines, it is acceptable for a Table to occupy up to two pages. Thank you once again.

Finally, we thank the reviewer for the kind comment, constructive criticisms and useful suggestions for which we have used to improve our manuscript. We have re read the whole manuscript once again and made any necessary editorial corrections. Thank you for the helpful review once again.