FIRST REVISION

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission
----
1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article
        Good

Remarks
        Satisfactory
2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.
        Good
Remarks
        Great
3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner
        Good

Remarks
        Satisfactory
4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.
        Good

Remarks
        good
5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?
        Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.
        Good

Remarks
        Good
7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.
        Regular

Remarks
        Regular

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.
    Good

Remarks
    Good

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.
    Good

Remarks
    Good

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?
    Acceptable

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it
    Accepted

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

----

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article
    Good

Remarks
2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.
    Good

Remarks
3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner
    Good

Remarks
4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.
    Good

Remarks

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

> Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

> Good

Remarks

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

> Good

Remarks

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

> Good

Remarks

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

> Good

Remarks

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

> Acceptable

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

> No considerations.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

----
1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

> Good

Remarks

It could be more specific and concise, for example: "Hematological Alterations and CD4+ Count in Patients with Mycobacterium tuberculosis Infection in Adamawa, Nigeria." Corrected

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.
Regular

Remarks
Too much data in the results section can be confusing. The data were such that they give a brief highlight for each Table and figure, so when read from this point it cannot be confusing.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner
Regular

Remarks
The introduction lacks a clear articulation of the research gap. It is necessary to explicitly state why this study is unique and how it addresses existing gaps.
Some references are outdated and should be replaced with more recent literature (preferably post-2018). updated

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.
Regular

Remarks
Sampling: The method of participant selection is not well-defined. Indicate whether randomization or convenience sampling was used and justify it.
Indicated
Bias Control: The manuscript does not discuss how bias was mitigated in sample collection or laboratory processes.Corrected
Data Analysis: While SPSS 22.0 is mentioned, the statistical tests used (e.g., t-tests, ANOVA) are not adequately detailed. Consider specifying statistical assumptions and whether they were met. done
Sample Size Calculation: The sample size justification based on the Taro Yamane formula lacks details on assumptions such as population variability and significance level. done

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?
Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.
Regular

Remarks
        Confidence intervals for the means and differences should be reported to
        provide better statistical clarity.
        Figures and tables should be streamlined to avoid redundancy, ensuring they
        convey essential information clearly.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.
        Regular

Remarks
        There is a lack of critical analysis of the results. The discussion reiterates
        findings without sufficiently exploring their implications or limitations.
        Limitations are not adequately discussed. Address issues like small sample size,
        regional specificity, and potential confounding factors.
        Include a comparison with recent global or regional studies to contextualize the
        findings better.
        Highlight the originality and clinical relevance of the study. For example,
        discuss how baseline hematological assessments can improve TB management
        strategies. done

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.
        Regular

Remarks
        The conclusions should directly address the objectives and avoid
        overgeneralizations. done
        Avoid including recommendations that are not directly supported by the data
        presented. done
9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.
        Regular

Remarks
        Many references are outdated. Replace older sources with recent studies to
        enhance the manuscript's credibility. done
10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?
        Needs some language corrections

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it
While ethical approval and consent are mentioned, provide more details on measures taken to maintain data confidentiality and ensure participant protection. done

SECOND REVISION

Response to Review 3

The objective of the study should be directly mentioned at the end of the introduction section. Done

The methodology section should be better described, the sample studied is not fully understood.

What was the required sample size? It should be mentioned. Done

How were the cases and controls selected? Was it 1:1, what were the characteristics of the controls with respect to the cases? Done

Only the px with hiv and tb were studied? then what is the sense of the other parameters and comparison of suspicious patients and tb. The comparison of the CD4 and haematological parameters was between HIV and MDR TB infected patients with apparaently healthy individuals (control).

How many patients finally entered the group of cases and controls. indicated

Only px with pulmonary tb were studied? Pulmonary TB and HIV coinfetion

How many were positive suspects and how many were negative suspects. indicated

Figure 1 does not adequately show the differences in leukocytes and ESR, choose another way to represent it or better just keep the text. Figure deleted

As for table 2, there is a lot of repetition in the text, mention 1 or 2 relevant results. Done

The conclusion is extensive. Focus on the objective of the study.

After all this, address the title. Addressed as