



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_35106</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ESTIMATION OF SERUM LIPID PROFILE AND ITS CORRELATION WITH ALVEOLAR BONE HEIGHT IN CHRONIC PERIODONTITIS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript, entitled "ESTIMATION OF SERUM LIPID PROFILE AND ITS CORRELATION WITH ALVEOLAR BONE HEIGHT IN CHRONIC PERIODONTITIS" is clearly within the scope of <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a></p> <p>Maxillary sinus augmentation bygraft-free two-stage sinus lift using titanium bone fixation device and implants</p> <p>Maxillary sinus augmentation bygraft-free two-stage sinus lift using titanium bone fixation device and implant</p> <p>While the Article is interesting there are numerous issues that require further clarifications; some are minor and others are more important; I did list them all not necessarily in order of importance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This appears to be a well-done manuscript demonstrating lipid levels and chronic periodontitis. However, the manner in which the paper is written is at times quite confusing, and there are items in the Discussion that seem to be contradictory without adequate explanation.</li> <li>2. The language needs to be improved throughout the manuscript both for grammar and wording.</li> <li>3. The abstract and Conclusion needs to be rewritten completely for better clarity.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This appears to be a well-done manuscript demonstrating lipid levels and chronic periodontitis. However, the manner in which the paper is written is at times quite confusing, and there are items in the Discussion that seem to be contradictory without</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>adequate explanation. 2. The language needs to be improved throughout the manuscript both for grammar and wording. 3. The abstract and Conclusion needs to be rewritten completely for better clarity.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>1. This appears to be a well-done manuscript demonstrating lipid levels and chronic periodontitis. However, the manner in which the paper is written is at times quite confusing, and there are items in the Discussion that seem to be contradictory without adequate explanation. 2. The language needs to be improved throughout the manuscript both for grammar and wording. 3. The abstract and Conclusion needs to be rewritten completely for better clarity.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Abdullah Seckin Ertugrul</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Izmir Katip Celebi University, Turkey</i></b>