

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_112867
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Sensitivity and Resistance Associated with Porphyromonas gingivalis Present in Periodontitis Frameworks
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is about an integrative review on antimicrobial sensitivity and resistance with regards to Porphyromonas gingivalis. However, the methodology is poorly planned. Only one database (Pubmed) was searched for relevant articles and very limited Keywords were used. The entire review does not follow the exact aim of the study. PICO is poorly designed in relation to the title and aim of the study.</p> <p>Title should include study design. Study design should be corrected in the header. It is an integrative review (mentioned by the authors later in the study), not an original article.</p> <p>Abstract should be structured. Otherwise, it is satisfactory.</p> <p>Results have not been discussed appropriately. No subheadings have been created. Included studies with a flow diagram/table should be in results and not the methodology/ Study characteristics, Measures of Outcome should be listed in results.</p> <p>Serious inaccuracies are present in the aim and methodology of the study. Either aim should be changed , or methodology should be modified.</p> <p>References are decent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Language is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Priyanshu Kumar Shrivastava</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jamia Millia Islamia, India</b>