

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_124870
Title of the Manuscript:	Periodontitis an essential comorbidity in CKD: A review
Type of the Article	Original study

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Periodontitis is a most common disease of oral cavity and known as major risk factor for non communicable diseases. Periodontitis increases the systemic inflammatory mediators leading to worsen the health of CKD patients. Early diagnosis and treatment of such periodontal conditions of CKD patients could decrease the inflammatory burden and thereby improve the quality of life.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Periodontitis an essential comorbidity in CKD: A review ALTERNATIVE TITLE- Periodontitis an essential comorbidity in CKD: A prospective study	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	YES	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In my opinion the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it is conducted simply, precisely and completely understandable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
Minor REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Ethical approval- if possible duly signed approval by the appropriate ethics committee needed to be uploaded to the editor	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nimmi Singh
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences, India