

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78797
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative assessment of P. gingivalis level in periodontitis patients with and without diabetes mellitus- A PCR based study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sample Collection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaboration whether sample size was statistically sufficient or not should be mentioned, since only 20 samples were collected mentioning the sample sufficiency will enhance the level of evidence of the study. - Details about Sterilization of instruments used during sample collection to be elucidated so that issues of cross contamination from other bacterial species during sample collection are avoided. - Details of sample storage at -80 degree Celsius- whether any specialized equipment was used to be mentioned. 2. Statistical Analysis: Abstract mentions the use of "Graphpad prism" for statistical analysis while main manuscript states the use of "SPSS software" for statistics- This does not match. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction of running title "Perodontit is" to be corrected as "Periodontitis". 2. Scientific name of bacteria to be quoted as <i>Porphyromonas gingivalis</i> instead of Porphyromonas gingivalis all throughout the manuscript, the bacteria name is to be italicized while quoting. 3. Introduction: " Our team has extensive knowledgepublications"- such comments should be avoided. 4. Materials and Methods: Reason as to why no control group of healthy individuals was taken up to establish baseline to be included to enhance manuscript authenticity. 5. Inclusion Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short forms like: PD, AL, BOP should be avoided and full forms written to ensure clarity to the readers. - "show-ing" to be replaced with "showing"- no hyphenation mark required. 6. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The reason for this increased level of P. gingivalis.....premature loss of teeth"- Kindly quote authors and the year of study who gave the above conclusions to better authenticate the comment. - Grossi and others.....AGEs in the serum"- Grossi and others to be replaced with Grossi <i>et al.</i> along with mentioning the year of the study. - "Tervonen and Kajalainen....."- Kindly mention the year in which the study was conducted as well. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All quoted Authors and years of study to be kept bold to highlight them and "<i>et al.</i>" to be italicized throughout the manuscript wherever used. 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Informed Consent and Confidentiality of patient records from whom samples were obtained	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deval Kumar Arora
Department, University & Country	Government Medical College Shahjahanpur, India