

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 13532

Title: Effect of periodontal treatment on adipokines in type 2 diabetes

Reviewer code: 02445638

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-08-27 11:44

Date reviewed: 2014-09-06 01:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Ogawa et al. have written a fine review exploring the role adipokines may or may not play in the correlation of periodontal disease and Type 2 diabetes. They provide an overview of the topic that is informative and well written, and provide existing evidence for eight individual possible molecular mediators. The article is also very well, and highly referenced. The only question I have regards the inconclusive nature of the conclusion. The author's state that current knowledge is not complete, and suggest that there have been only limited studies and that these and the number of human subjects should be increased in future research. Nowhere in the review is there mention of statistical significance, and surely these studies couldn't have been published without the right statistical tests done in them. So it comes across that it is the reviewer's opinion that more and bigger studies need to be done. This may be correct, but it could be substantiated better by explaining to the reader what was significant in the studies that were done, and what wasn't, and how that was determined.