



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Medicine and Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJMAH_41289 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Expression of TLRs and CD14 does not necessarily correlate with the type of pathogenic bacteria in the tonsils of tonsillectomy 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://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 (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 | 1. The introduction is too short and offers little information that relates the interaction between the TLRs, CD14 coreceptors and the type of bacteria. It is recommended to expand this section. | Throughout our knowledge, the function of the introduction is to present the background of a project, showing or discussing basic references related to the main topic, and indicating the purposes of the works. All three components are already in the introduction section. However, in order to clarify the research questions and research objectives, this section is corrected as follows. However, there have been no scientific reports explaining whether the expression of CD14 is associated to the type of pathogenic bacteria responsible for the disease. Therefore, current study is aimed to investigate whether expression of TLRs, especially TLR2 and 4, and their CD14-coreceptors correlated with the type of pathogenic bacteria in the tonsils of patients with chronic tonsillitis. |
| | 2. There is no coherence between the research question and the title of the article, they seem two different works. It is recommended to standardize the writing of both, based on what the author wants to express. Title: "Expression of TLRs and CD14 does not necessarily correlate with the type of pathogenic bacteria in the tonsils of tonsillectomy patients" Question: "the question is whether TLRs, especially TLR2 and 4, and their CD14-coreceptors account for the type of pathogenic bacteria in the tonsils?" | OK. To make it coherent we replace <u>account-for</u> phrases by correlated with . So that the revised version of the new paragraph is as follows: However, there have been no scientific reports explaining whether the expression of CD14 is associated to the type of pathogenic bacteria responsible for the disease. Therefore, current study is aimed to investigate whether expression of TLRs, especially TLR2 and 4, and their CD14-coreceptors correlated with the type of pathogenic bacteria in the tonsils. |
| | 3. In this section "2.4 CD14 assessment" It is convenient to clarify for which type of cells the CD14+ and CD3 + marker was used, they mix it in the text and it is not clear. | In our opinion, this section has been written quite clearly. |
| | 4. It is necessary to explain the reason why determined TLRS by immunohistochemistry on tissue (tonsils) and CD14 + and CD3 + markers in peripheral blood by flow cytometry. To compare them, it would not be better to do everything by immunohistochemistry? In the introduction show the finding in situ "In patients subjected to adenoidectomies due to chronic adenoid inflammation and hypertrophy, CD14 expression is found in all specimen analyzed using immunohistochemical techniques [7]" | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are very familiar with the quality standards of scientific research. However, since the research has been completed, we can only report what has been obtained. Again, regarding reviewer's sentence: "In the introduction show the finding in situ" there is inaccuracy. In the "In patients subjected to adenoidectomies due to chronic adenoid inflammation and hypertrophy, CD14 expression is found in all specimen analyzed using immunohistochemical techniques [7]" has been written clearly "all specimen" which meant ex situ. Therefore, we think nothing needs to be changed in this section. |
| | 5. Never was mention the number of patients used. This causes that the writing of the results is not clear. Do they talk about crops or number of samples? | OK. Although implicitly the number of patients depicted on the data, we add (n = 34) after "The research subjects were children.." in the "2.1 Research subjects" section. |
| | 6. Review the data of the tables and the statistical tests. If the standard deviation is greater than or equal to the mean, it can be inferred that the data are not homogeneous and it is worth presenting them with medians and nonparametric tests. | We believe, although statistical analysis is improved, the meaning of the data will not change. Therefore, in our opinion, there is no need to revise data analysis. |
| | 7. A section of Discussion is required, although the description of the tables that they present seems to be a discussion. It is advisable to title and write the section in discussion format. | It is because the SDI manuscript template do not separate the results section from the discussion section , but unite them in the Results and Discussion section. |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | The article is interesting and brings new knowledge to the field of medicine, it is recommended to accept it with major modifications once the important points are corrected. | Thank you for the encouraging comments and suggestions. |