



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_44125
Title of the Manuscript:	Oral bacteriome compositions identified by 16S rRNA metagenomics in a randomly selected “healthy” Nigerian male and female subjects.
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>)

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 study is informative, unique and well written, However the sample size is too less to conclude with any viable result. 2) On what basis the sample of 19 subjects has been chosen? 3) What is the objective of the study and how is it useful for future investigation and treatment planning? What is the use of information regarding the core oral bacteriome of healthy Nigerian individuals? Would it help in future investigation of different oral diseases and treatment planning? If yes kindly elaborate it. 4) Few sentences are not well structured and need to be rephrased. 5) Kindly check for the spelling mistakes ? 6) Kindly include some of the articles of journals in the references.	1. We thank the reviewer for stating the obvious that our study is informative and unique. Yes, we agree with the reviewer that the sample size is small, however, we have reflected this in the conclusion. 2. The basis for the selection of the 19 subjects were clearly stated in the methods. 3. The objective of the study was clearly stated in the last part of the introduction. Understanding the core bacteriome is very important in terms of knowing the deviation from diseased conditions. We have highlighted this in the introduction. It should be noted that knowledge of the oral bacteriome composition is a <i>sine qua non</i> in the determination of microbial deviation in oral diseased conditions and has the potential to provide an insight for treatment plans and future investigations 4. We have restructured and rephrased some sentences. 5. Spelling mistakes have been checked. 6. An article from journals has been included in the reference (23). Wu j, Lin IH, Hayes RB, Ahn J. Comparison of DNA extraction methods for human oral microbiome research. British J Med & Medical Res 2014; 4(10): 1980-1991
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>