

## **Reviewer # 1**

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, the novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

**Authors' comments:** Yes, there were many controversies in studies that are related to our topic of the manuscript, the most recent and important achievement, the novelty of the recent achievement is highlighted in the manuscript with the yellow highlight color. We have also reported the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming into existence and what could be the possible reason behind them.

**Authors' comments:** We have worked on the results and discussion section, and also explained certain effects, and the reason behind them which is in the manuscript with a yellow highlighted color.

3. Conclusion: not properly written.

**Authors' comments:** The conclusion has been written again.

4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

**Authors' comments:** we have worked hard to explain the results with the main findings (yellow highlighted). The conclusion is provided according to the aim of the review article. Kindly suggest to us if further amendments are required.

5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

**Authors' comments:** Results discussion arguments are provided in yellow and highlighted in the text of the manuscript.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

**Authors' comments:** We have carefully gone through the entire manuscript and tried to reduce the grammatical errors (highlighted in yellow color).

7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

**Authors' comments:** We have carefully gone through the entire manuscript and tried to reduce the grammatical errors (highlighted in yellow color).

## **Reviewer # 2**

1. Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

2. Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

3. Conclusion: Minor revision

**Authors comments:** I have made amendments to the conclusion.

4. Specific Comments to Authors: this review article aim to report the relationship between these hematological parameters in the development of Diabetes Mellitus. good

**Authors comments:** Thank you for your appreciating us.