

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83789
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative evaluation of salivary leptin levels in healthy and chronic periodontitis patients with or without Diabetes Mellitus
Type of the Article	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This study addresses an interesting point of saliva leptin levels in periodontitis with and without diabetes as compared top healthy controls. The authors used appropriate method to measure leptin in saliva by ELISA.</p> <p>However, there are serious concerns and points of weakness that must be properly addressed and clarified before this manuscript can be accepted for publication. Here are the most important <u>serious concerns or points of weak/poor structure</u> (indicated based on inserted page and line numbers):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Page 1, line 10-13 in abstract, (introduction part of the abstract), : <u>Pasting from the text:</u> which has recently gained attention due to its role in regulating metabolism of the human body as well as affecting the body's defence mechanisms, including macrophages. Criticism: weak draft. It is very broad to say regulating of metabolism. Instead, you can say regulating energy expenditure, food intake and weight gain. Also, it is not accepted to say defence mechanisms, including macrophages. Macrophages is NOT a mechanism. You have to be more specific in choosing scientifically proper words, you can read several papers such as Fernández-Riejos P. et al. , 2010, Role of Leptin in the Activation of Immune Cells, mediators of Inflammation, Volume 2010 Article ID 568343. You can write defense mechanisms, including activation and of proliferation of macrophages. There are several other mechanisms, where leptin modulate immune response so you can mention 1 or 2 more, since this is pertinent to your story. You do not have to repeat what you wrote in introduction, again, in discussion.2. Re: study design: The authors used thirty patients (30) and divided these 30 patients into three groups. The authors did NOT state clearly number of patients in each group. Is it n=10 per each group or n is 5, 15, 10 for the three groups, respectively as identified in the text? It is very important to clearly state this number in ea.3. Accuracy of inclusion criteria. The authors did NOT specify about diabetes millets, is it type 1 or type 2 diabetes! If, for example diabetic patients with periodontitis are 6 type 1, 4 type 2, then they should have four groups and still they can use one way anoa test.4. The authors can not report that they used equal number from both genders (male and female). They should just mention that participants were mixed males and females, because it is not known how many males vs females in each group of the three groups. , unless they used 5 females in each group, and 5 males in each group. , then they can say that they used equal number of male and female subjects in each group.5. Results: No need to present table (tabulated data) , if the same data are plotted and presented into figure.6. If you presented/plotted data in the figure with SE, the in the text, authors should write SE in consistency with the figure. In the legend for fig. 1, they should mention that leptin	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>values are presented as mean +/- SE</p> <p>7. Discussion: It is poor draft and structure, when the authors re-write introductory statements, exact text as in introduction of the paper. Rather they should start discussion by brief specific description of role of leptin in Inflammation from the literature, followed by brief presenting of the main finding of their study (which they did down) , then possible explanation, among which is that leptin has chemotactic inflammatory effect, and diabetes is an inflammatory condition, as such leptin could be a reflection to the synergism in inflammatory response between periodontitis and diabetes.</p> <p>The rest of discussion is well-drafted and indicates that other authors found correlation between serum leptin and clinical periodontal parameters, which flows with present findings.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. In Inclusion criteria (page 82, 83). what is ++ (is it +/- mistakenly written ++ !</p> <p>2. In the text, healthy participant should not be described, or included with the term (patients), rather they should be described as healthy participants or healthy subjects. They are not patients like the other two groups.</p> <p>3. Page 5, in Statistical analysis, they should mention <u>one way</u> Anova test (for more accuracy).</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Overall, the study is well designed and performed</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Osama Kishta
Department, University & Country	University of Prince Edward Island, Canada