

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78010
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF WHITE BLOOD CELL COUNT AND ITS DIFFERENTIAL IN BLEEDING GUM PATIENTS
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The background is very long- No scientific aim at the end of the background was mentioned: (to check the possibilities for the patient to get cancer !!!), where is the evidence- No results are seen <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- They didn't use the citation correctly in the introduction, many phrases without clear citation.- Self-Citing for around (20 references out of 35), without clear scientific content and even for unrelated topics, at the end of the introduction, this is not acceptable! <p>All these references should be excluded and new references only related to the paper topic should be mentioned in a proper place.</p> <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The methodology section is very week scientifically, and not described in details.- There is no approval from the investigation board of the responsible authorities- There is no clear gender- related sample size- How was the sample size calculated?- Age of the sample has changed many times throughout the paper, sometimes starts from10, another place from 20 years!- How was the WBC counted? it's not mentioned. <p>Statistical analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- No details in the statistical analysis?- Under which significance level?- How was it done?- Error estimation? <p>Results and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In this section, the authors presented their findings with only very few phrases discussing the results- Expand more in the discussion section- they mentioned that this research was performed on 100 patients with chronic periodontitis, how could you assess it,- chronic periodontitis is different from bleeding gums, which they mentioned in the aim, and the title- How did you compare your findings with the normal value statistically?- They used different referencing style, (Johnstone et al., 2007), it is not even in the existing in reference list	<p>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

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>	