



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_35106
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF SERUM LIPID PROFILE AND ITS CORRELATION WITH ALVEOLAR BONE HEIGHT IN CHRONIC PERIODONTITIS
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: The statement “Although numerous studies have been previously carried out to find out any correlation between lipid profile and periodontitis” is vague. Please give reference for at-least 2 such previous studies.</p> <p>Methodology: Having only a lower cap of age in the inclusion criteria is a big confounding factor. The periodontal status of a 20 year old can not be compared to a 65 year old. A good study design should have as narrow age criteria as possible.</p> <p>Rather than using the mild, moderate and severe periodontitis, there are several more indices which are much more objective when it comes to assessing the severity of periodontitis. Also, no clinical parameters such as plaque index, sulcus bleeding index, gingival indices were used. Justify the usage of this classification.</p> <p>Results: Just mentioning the values is not correct. The authors must mention the statistical difference between the two groups even when the difference is not significant ($p>0.05$).</p> <p>Which tests were used to assess co-relation between periodontal and blood parameters is not mentioned.</p> <p>Another Major query is why the authors assessed co-relation with right and left side differently.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Historically, I have not come across any article in which there is such a statistical difference between right and left sides of the jaw in disease progression or correlation with any other parameters. If there is an article please quote the same, if not justify the difference in co-relation between right and left side.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Please provide reference “Some studies have found no relationship or an inverse relationship between chronic infection and hyperlipidemia.” And avoid making such statements without references.</p> <p>In results, you have mentioned the mean triglyceride in study group was 115.20 mg/dl, while in control group it was 99.91mg/dl. In discussion “Increased triglyceride levels when assessed between study and control group we found three fold increase in subjects with periodontitis” How is it three fold. Please abstain from overstating your results in such a way.</p> <p>Many studies have found a statistically significant co-relation between LDL levels and periodontitis. In spite of the good sample size in your study, you have not. Justify the same.</p> <p>Tables: mention the units of the values.</p> <p>DO not repeat the tables data in figures (Table 1 and figure 1)</p> <p>Conclusion does not mark the aim and objectives of the study. The statement that “Estimation of serum lipid profile especially HDL levels in subjects with periodontitis can be considered as</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>screening method for early diagnosis of atherosclerosis” is factually incorrect as increased HDL levels is a marker of atherosclerosis in ALL patients irrespective of their periodontal status.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>General spelling and grammar</p> <p>Update the references and eliminate unnecessary references. Some references like 24,46 have been mentioned in the manuscript while the list only contains 14. There are gross irregularities in the references. Ideally, for an original article upto 30 references are enough.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Rucha Shah</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Bapuji Dental College & Hospital, India</i>