

Manuscript: **“Influence Of Certain Nutritional Products On Periodontal Status”**

Submitted: 18 November 2021

Accepted: 17 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: **Urim Tefiku**

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p90](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p90)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gherbon Adriana, University of Medicine and Pharmacy V. Babes Timisoara

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Gherbon Adriana	
University/Country: University of Medicine and Pharmacy V. Babes Timisoara	
Date Manuscript Received: 03.12.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 11.12.2021
Manuscript Title: INFLUENCE OF CERTAIN NUTRITIONAL PRODUCTS ON PERIODONTAL STATUS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1218/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results, but it is too long. Please short it and also remove table 3.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. The references must put with the name of the first author and the year of publication, not with numbers.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>I don t find any conclusions. Please put the conclusions.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: