

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82708
Title of the Manuscript:	Oral mucosal cryoglobulin [ICD-10-CM Diagnostic Code D89.9 cryoglobulin] , oral mucosal herd immunity and the immune herd plots among periodontal disease patients
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>

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	<p>Keywords: In keywords, only one word starting with a capital letter;</p> <p>Abstract: Mention the gender of the patients in the abstract (how many female and male);</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Create the subtopic subjects, specifying the characteristics of the sample (gender, age, among other relevant data); Specify the type of study; Specify how the data were treated if there was any statistical procedure used; A paragraph on ethical issues is missing (if you have an ethics committee opinion if you applied an informed consent form, if you respected other ethical requirements for research on humans); The paragraph on possible conflicts of interest is missing;</p> <p>Results: Remove the space between the title and the tables; In table 03, place the unit *Mg/dl in parentheses and at the end of the table title; The correct way to present the unit is mg/dL and not *Mg/dl; Insert the legends for the X and Y axes of the graphs in the graphs themselves and the correct position; The concentration unit is missing on the X-axis of figures 1 and 2; The way the data is presented in the graphs is not adequate. The line gives the reader an idea that there were several collections in a timeline, but reading the methods and looking at the graphs is not clear. A well-made figure speaks for itself; Better explain what the so-called control columns, which appear in tables 2 and 3, represent;</p> <p>REFERENCES (19): Non-standard and incomplete references; Too many references to books or manuals, which impoverishes the work; 09 references prior to 2013, 06 (2013-2017) and only 3 of the last five years, which is not justified by the amount of more current articles available; Reference 11 has only a name and nothing else; There are two references 16 (which leads to a review of the authors' order throughout the text).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Do not repeat words in the title and keywords, as this reduces the chance of the paper being found in indexers (cryoglobulin, oral, mucosal);</p> <p>Introduction: A little poor and does not introduce the subject well;</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion is more like a literature review than a discussion, at no time are the findings compared and discussed with the literature; The conclusion presented is feeble.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>It might be more interesting to opt for column charts (figures);</p>	

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:	Luis Carlos Oliveira Gonçalves
Department, University & Country	Brazil