

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56833

Title: *Burning Mouth Syndrome and Its Associated Salivary Biomarkers*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- The manuscript addresses an important and relevant clinical problem, Burning Mouth Syndrome (BMS), which remains poorly understood and challenging to diagnose and manage.
- Emphasis on salivary biomarkers as non-invasive tools reflects a promising and innovative approach that could substantially aid in diagnosis and monitoring.
- The review compiles current knowledge on the multifactorial etiology, pathophysiology, and emerging diagnostic biomarkers, providing a comprehensive overview of the field.
- The manuscript references a broad range of relevant literature, indicating an extensive literature review.
- The discussion on the potential role of salivary cortisol, cytokines, and oxidative stress markers adds valuable insight into the biochemical mechanisms involved in BMS.

Weaknesses of the Study

- The manuscript appears to be a narrative review, but the methodology for literature selection and criteria for inclusion/exclusion are not described, affecting reproducibility and thoroughness.
- No evidence of original data, experimental results, or meta-analytical approach, limiting the contribution to synthesis rather than primary scientific discovery.
- There is no mention of whether the literature search was systematic or narrative, raising concerns about potential bias.
- The review does not address the variability and limitations of current salivary biomarker studies, including differences in collection methods, sample sizes, and analytical techniques.
- Ethical considerations, such as approval for studies involving human participants or informed consent, are not addressed.
- Some sections lack critical analysis concerning the sensitivity, specificity, and clinical applicability of the proposed biomarkers.
- Presentation issues include repetitive and somewhat verbose language, with minor typographical and grammatical errors throughout.
- References are extensive but could be better integrated into the discussion, and some are outdated.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title is clear and directly relevant. The abstract summarizes the scope effectively but could highlight the review methodology and key conclusions more explicitly. Avoiding overly complex sentences would improve clarity.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction provides a solid background on BMS, but explicitly stating the review's objectives and specific questions being addressed would enhance focus and reader understanding.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** As a review article, the methodology regarding literature search strategy is not described. Clarification on whether a systematic approach was employed, along with databases searched, inclusion criteria, and analysis methods, is essential for transparency.
- **Results and Discussion:** The discussion provides a comprehensive overview of salivary biomarkers; however, it lacks critical appraisal of the limitations and conflicting findings within the studies cited. Inclusion of recent evidence on diagnostic accuracy and validation of biomarkers would strengthen the manuscript.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion appropriately summarizes key points but would benefit from actionable recommendations for future research, including validation studies and clinical implementation pathways.
- **Ethical Clearance:** The manuscript does not specify whether ethical approval or informed consent was obtained in the studies reviewed. Clarification on this, especially if any primary data or patient samples are involved, is recommended.
- **Language and Grammar:** The manuscript is generally well-written but contains minor grammatical errors, inconsistent formatting, and some awkward phrasing. A thorough proofreading is necessary.
- **Tables, Figures, References:** No tables or figures are included, which could have enhanced clarity. References are relevant but need updating and consistent formatting, with some key studies missing.