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Reviewer's report:

This systematic review and meta-analysis aims to assess an important public health interest on the effect of tuberculosis disease on developing diabetes mellitus. The study aims to establish evidence from observational prospective studies which allows to determine the temporal sequence of whether TB increases the risk of DM or not.

I congratulate the authors for coming up with this important research topic.

Abstract
Lines 31-32: I suggest a bit of modification on the title to "...individuals with previously undiagnosed type 2 Diabetes Mellitus"
Line 40:Incomplete statement (previously undiagnosed....)
Lines 44-45: Authors are suggested to use a standard reporting guideline, PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses). I have seen this in the method section but it has to be mentioned here also.
Lines 48-49: The aim of sensitivity analysis, in my opinion, is to see the influence of a single study on the overall estimate. Therefore, authors should consider correcting the use of sensitivity analysis to check publication bias. Furthermore, there are several tools available to assess study quality, and i suggest that authors should mention which type of tool they would use to check the quality of studies they will include in their systematic review. Similar to the comment above, this has been discussed in the method section, but not reflected here.

Briefly report your response to these questions in the method section of the abstract. I have noted that these have been answered in detail in the body of the method section.
How do you check the between study heterogeneity?
Please state whether you do a sub-group analysis or not?
Which type of model would you use to estimate the summary effect (s)?
Consider using funnel plot and/or Beggs or Egger's test to assess publication bias

Lines 49-50: I don't see the importance of this statement here as the authors have already started the journey to publish their work.
Line 52: is it "in-transient hyperglycemia" or just "hyperglycemia". the term "in-transient hyperglycemia" remained in the title, and was not used in the remaining section of the document. For sake of consistency, however, it needs definition for appropriate use.

Background
check the journals citation style, it requires citation within square bracket.


Lines 85-88: Statements in these lines should be used together with other supporting evidence to elaborate the statement in line 77.

Line 81: comma is needed here after "...by rifampicin administration"

Line 96: edit punctuation, full stop is needed before "Secondly"

Line 100: "Our protocol has been registered PROSPERO (CRD42019118173)." Better to provide an active link.

Methods
Line 113: edit as "...DM cases will be excluded"

Line 117: does your study consider including all age groups? please elaborate on this. There was also no mention of the type of TB and diagnostic requirement/s.

Line 124: i suggest authors to include search strings used and number of identified studies per data base searched.

Line 131: also consider whether the study adjusted for con-founder or not

Line 132: expand this on first use

Strengths and limitations
Line 171: make sure that you included all the major data bases not to miss potential articles than just mention this as a strength. I rather appreciate that the authors plan to use risk of bias assessment (and grading of evidence), sub-group analysis and meta-regression if there is any heterogeneity.

List of abbreviations
Line 182: abbreviations used in the document are not exhaustively listed
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