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Reviewer's report:

MANUSCRIPT REVISION
In the present study authors performed a Lymphocyte transformation assay in order to detect cellular impairment in patients with Neurocryptococcosis. The manuscript is well written and methods are well described. However some points need to be reviewed, that must be considered to publication with major revision:

Minor essential revision
1) In the title page, Departamento de Fonoaudiologia (3) is not attributed to any author.
2) Abstract: de acronyms PBMC, LTA, KAg and NCC should be written in full the first time they are mentioned.
3) Methods:
   a) Where Jurumin is located? Insert State and Country
   b) Where Amparo Maternal is located? Insert State and Country
   c) Insert city, State and country for each company cited as Immunomycol-Inc
4) Procedures
   a) Describe what means PBMC when used for the first time.
   b) The acronym PWM do not need to be described again.

Major compulsory revision
1) keywords: a better choose of words must be set, based on MeSH - Medical Subject Headings or other equivalent
2) Abstract: The aim of the study is not clear. The phrase must be rewritten.
3) Background: The aims of the study are not clear. The phrase must be rewritten.
4) Methods:
   a) the protocol for species confirmation is published anywhere? If yes, please cite.
5) Procedures:
   a) The lymphocyte transformation assay was applied to all samples? It is mentioned in the 3rd paragraph as used for peripheral blood of healthy donors
and newborn cord cells and in the 4th paragraph the authors mentioned that used it for all patients, as expected. Also, different volumes of blood were cited. Uniformize the citation.

Discussion

a) The differences between the present work and the work performed by Miller and Puck in 1984 should be better discussed.

b) There is no correspondence between objectives and conclusions.

c) It was no clear in the text if there is another method to evaluate cellular impairment in patients with cryptococcosis.

Figure 2: Why only 22 patients instead of were submitted to LTA?

Figure 1
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