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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

ABSTRACT:

Methods: (4mm<6mm ) does that mean pockets with 4 to 6mm probing depth? This can be expressed as (4 to 6 mm, or #6 mm periodontal pocket) through out the text.

Results: p value must be in lower case.

Conclusions: It is the repetition of the results, not concluding.

BACKGROUND:

3rd sentence: Ref 2 is not suitable for this sentence, because that study is on Type 1 DM.

4th sentence: Write C. albicans with full name, as it is first time used in the text (do not count the abstract).

5th sentence: ref 4 is not supporting this sentence.

MATERIAL METHODS:

Collection of oral yeast samples: (Kadir et al. 2002) give the ref. no.

RESULTS:

Study population: there is a mistake in the data here. Number of C. albicans positive subjects is 29, with 17 male and 12 female. Number of C. albicans negative subjects is also 29, with 6 male and 23 female. This makes the whole study population 23 male and 35 female. It was said to be 29 male and 29 female, before.

Oral yeast colonization in subjects with T2D: First two sentences belong to discussion, and again ref.no. must be at the end.

In subtitles C. albicans are not in italic.

DISCUSSION:

4th paragraph last sentence: Is it possible to come to this conclusion? We do not know the prevalence of denture-wearing between males and females. It is not true to conclude like that with out giving the prevalence in the results.

5th paragraph: It is giving a wrong impression like age does not effect C. albicans colonisation. So instead of saying “age does not seem to influence” it might be
better to say “age can not be the effect on the differences in C. albicans colonisation, as it was adjusted in both groups”.

Last sentence: Confusing, better if it is simplified.

FIGURES:

It would be better to put the subjects with out C. albicans into the figures 2 and 3, so that we could make better comparisons.
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