

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	

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>)

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"> In the section of the article "MATERIALS AND METHODS" it is necessary to indicate the total number of patients, the number of patients in Group I periodontitis patients without diabetes mellitus and in Group II periodontitis patients with diabetes mellitus. in table 1 it is necessary to indicate which statistical method was used to analyze the results. If the number of patients is small or the distribution of results is uneven, only nonparametric methods of analysis can be used. authors write «Figure 1 reveals the three fold increase of P.gingivalis level in periodontitis patients with diabetes mellitus than patients without diabetes.» It doesn't match the data Figure 1!!! 1.35 is not more than three times 1! It is misinterpretation of results. REFERENCES is desirable to modify. Exclude REFERENCES 15-30 years old (№1,4 -7,15,16,38-41,43). Add modern publications. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 2 contains data completely analogous to the data in table 1. Figure 2 can be excluded from publication. The list of publications of the authors ([17–29],[30–34][35][36]), which is not related to this study, it is advisable to exclude. 	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tsubanova Natalia
Department, University & Country	National University of Pharmacy, Ukraine