

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81837
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION OF BLOOD SUGAR LEVELS AND CHRONIC PERIODONTITIS VISITING PRIVATE DENTAL HOSPITAL
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. The present title is very vague and not specific. The authors may prefer to revise the title to better reflect the study. They may prefer a title like 'Correlation of blood sugar levels and chronic periodontitis in out-patients visiting a dental hospital'. Or the authors may modify it to reflect the same wording it differently. 2. Running title to needs to be modified. Authors may prefer, "Correlation of blood sugar levels chronic periodontitis in out-patients" or their own title. 3. Abstract: In the Introduction section, there is a need to specify the site of affliction. 'Periodontitis is a common inflammatory disease affecting the gums characterized by destruction of supporting structures of the teeth'. Also, the last sentence in the Introduction - Did the authors mean that the risk of chronic periodontitis is increased three folds in diabetic individuals? Please correct Aim: Once again please specify, 'patients with chronic periodontitis' as only patients can visit the hospital and this cannot be implied in the current statement. Materials & Methods: What does 'data was rewired' mean? Please indicate what is the acronym DIAS. This is the first instance of the use of an acronym, so please ensure the full expansion. Results: Last senetence - We do not need to mention the proportion of the male and female population with CP (Chronic Periodontitis). Just the proportion of patients with diabetes will suffice or it is an unnecessary repetition. 4. Introduction section: So, is that the only reason what prompted the study? Any other reason like inadequate local data etc. Please refer to all comments in main manuscript that has been outlined. Too numerous to quote here. 5. Materials & Methods: How was this sample size obtained and calculated? What was the significance level? What method was used to calculate the sample size? Other minor comments please refer to original manuscript. There was absolutely no explanation in the materials & methods as to how the investigators discerned that the patients had high blood sugar levels? Did they get this info from the case records? Why wasn't this mentioned. What was looked at...was it the actual blood sugar levels, HbA1C levels or just the remark that they were diabetic. 6. Results: Already outlined in the results sections. Instead of placing the observations as tet beneath the figures, it is better to use text as main results. The figures should be stand-alone and self-explanatory. 7. Discussion: Please refer to all comments in main manuscript that has been outlined. Too numerous to quote here. The limitations of this study were never specified in the first place. Please specify the limitations as the last paragraph in the 'Discussion' section. 8. Conclusions: There was absolutely no explanation in the materials & methods as to how the investigators discerned that the patients had high blood sugar levels? Did they get this info from the case records? Why wasn't this mentioned. What was looked at...was it the actual blood sugar levels, HbA1C levels or just the remark that they were diabetic. Please refer to all comments in main manuscript that has been outlined. Too numerous to quote here. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Need to check and revise the use of grammar. Better to use a professional proof-reading service to enhance the readability of the manuscript.	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Simple paper but the conclusions are drawn on a very miniscule sample. Having reviewed 5,35,951 case sheets from June 2019 - February 2021, it is surprising that only 65 patients were taken as a sample size. That is why the investigators need to specify how this sample size was arrived at? With the proportion of patients in the sample that had diabetes as reported by the investigators, there should obviously have been much more patients. So, keeping this in mind, I would recommend a MAJOR REVISION. None specified. Therefore, it is mandatory to mention the ethical clearance from the University Research Committee (if obtained).	
----------------------------------	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uday Kumar Umesan
Department, University & Country	Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Brunei