



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_14108
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between gingivitis and autism in children: A matched case-control study
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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- How do you define mild, moderate and severe autism? - Please mention where all did you check for plaque, gingival and calculus index. I mean which all teeth, how many surfaces per teeth. Because 14/43 cannot have full mouth gingival scores as "Zero". This can happen only in experimental totally aseptic conditions or immediately post scaling. Please explain. - No statistical tests have been done using microbiological data. Why so? Also please clarify whether microbiological tests were done in just autistic group or both groups? - Please elaborate your discussion. Discuss your findings in detail and justify the results of your study. eg: You say calculus is statistically more significant in autistics. Gingival and plaque scores are insignificantly higher in autistics. But again on correlation you say calculus is positively correlated with development of gingivitis. This leaves the reader confused. You say 68% where of the age group 4-12 years, which means primary and mixed dentition. Whereas others had permanent dentition. Did you find any difference between the primary, missed and permanent dentition among the	- We followed society documents. - We have a raw data which I can include but that very hard to include in table for autistic and non-autistic group as may not be the interest of reader. Results were summarise in statistical tables.. - Manuscript is on calculus and gingival index so we took out this half information from paper as study is still progressing. - Noted with thanks. We will make necessary elaboration in discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	subjects wrt calculus and plaque?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In abstract do not mention these three bacteria, Please mention the names of the bacterias here. 2. Abstract result just mention $P>0.05$ or $p<0.05$ 3. Line 67, spell constraints correctly 4. Line 96, please mention the original authors of plaque, gingival and calculus index as reference. 5. Line 103: Never heard of collecting plaque with a probe!!!	1. Noted with thanks made changes in revised manuscript. 2. noted 3. We will make changes in spelling. 4. Noted with thanks. 5. That was typo error in hurry. We will make changes.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Elaborate discussion.	Noted.