



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_35143
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SOME BIOCHEMICAL OXIDATIVE STRESS MARKERS IN TYPE II DIABETICS AND NON-DIABETICS WITH 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 (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	ABSTRACT 1. Remove place and duration of study, study design and add it in 'materials and methods' section. METHODOLOGY 1. Age matching with controls has not been done. Justify. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 1. It can be categorized into 2 different sections under the heading 'RESULTS' and 'DISCUSSION' rather than having 2 pages of it. 2. The 'RESULTS' section should describe the results of the study and highlight on the significant findings 3. The 'DISCUSSION' section should highlight on the uniqueness of the study with the limitations and future scope TABLES Tables should be formatted for better understanding. LANGUAGE CORRECTION Overall there are major grammatical mistakes.	ABSTRACT: The place and duration of the study was incorporated as per journal's requirements. The manuscript was typed on the journal's template. METHODOLOGY: Among the study groups, the control group was the youngest and the diabetic group was the oldest. Literature suggests that the disease periodontitis shows an onset age of around 35 yrs, hence CP and CPDM groups were of higher age than the controls, which has young volunteers also. Therefore, we could not do age matching with the controls. Kindly suggest corrective measures. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: The results and discussion sections were combined as per the journal's requirement. The manuscript was typed on the journal's template. TABLES: Formatting done as suggested LANGUAGE CORRECTION: We apologize for the grammatical errors. The manuscript now is proofread by a language expert to minimize these errors.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A study by Thomas et al has done a similar comparison, please mention the uniqueness of the study https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25210258	Our study has taken into consideration the clinical parameters in conjunction with biochemical parameters which are major representatives of oxidative stress profile. For example, TAS represents putative AO capacity, SOD, GPx are important antioxidant enzymes Vitamin C belongs to non enzymatic water soluble antioxidant And MDA is established OS biochemical marker representing lipid peroxidation.