



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">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.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?"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.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]"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?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.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.	
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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beatriz Elina Martínez Carrillo
Department, University & Country	Research Nutrition and Immunonutrition Laboratory, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, México