

Review of: "Impact of risk factor diabetes mellitus on patients with periodontitis"

Martin Levine¹

¹ University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

I find this paper rather oddly written – more like a series of disconnected comments than a proper review. I am uncomfortable with the first sentence of the abstract and suggest replacing it with the first sentence of the introduction. The latter sentence could remain in the Introduction if it is introduced with, ‘As stated in the abstract, ...’ The title is written from the point of view of a diabetes expert, whereas the abstract is written from the point of view of a periodontist. The title should therefore be changed to, “The impact of periodontitis on adult onset (type 2) diabetes” and 3 major headings, Periodontitis, Diabetes, and Relationship of Periodontitis to Diabetes may help the author pull the evidence together in a more understandable format.

After describing periodontal disease, the author may want to discuss juvenile diabetes to make the review more complete. He should summarize the cause, age of the patient, and treatment and explain how juvenile differs from adult-onset diabetes and go on to discuss adult-onset diabetes in detail. The last section should discuss how periodontitis and adult-onset diabetes are related to each other, but why neither is related to juvenile diabetes. As written, the text is a bit incoherent and difficult to follow.

Here are some additional comments:

1. Please rewrite to better separate the human and animal studies, give a longer statement of what was found from each study, and how the animal studies shed light on the human studies.
2. The sentence referencing the Bouchard paper (Ref. 21) makes no sense to me. Either it should be explained better or deleted. Also in the first sentence of the last paragraph, ‘the findings of Alshihayb ...’ should be followed by the reference number (31), not the year.
3. Finally, parts of this review seem to be written for a medical practitioner, and parts for a periodontist. I think that dividing the paper into the 3 major sections described above might eliminate that problem.