

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJOB_98388 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | METOPISM: IT'S PREVALENCE & MORPHOMETRY IN ADULT NIGERIAN DRY SKULLS |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References used, majority are outdated. Kindly find recent journals (about 5 years back) for references purposes.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Very good article with good grammar. However the formatting of the manuscript can be further improved. There are many full stops missing and the spacing of the alphabets can be corrected. For the methods section, please include the sampling calculation on how many skulls should be appropriately investigated to make the study more relevant. Please insert the statistical analysis section. What were the statistical calculations used? Discussion is appropriate. Good job. The conclusion can be improved by relating the findings and the usefulness of the research findings in fractures for example. Elaborate a bit about this. References used, majority are outdated. Kindly find recent journals (about 5 years back) for references purposes. Minor correction needed. Good luck and all the best!</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Azmah Saat |
| Department, University & Country | Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia |