

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_96063 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Discriminant Function Analysis of Mandibular Condyle and Notch for sex Determination. |
| 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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) |
|---|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This study is significant as it provides a new method for determining sex using mandible measurements, which could have potential forensic and anthropological applications • The title is clear and suitable for the research article • The material is ordered in a logical and clear way • Literature review could be improved by adding recent and more relevant references • The writing style is clear • references should be properly cited in the research paper • References should be written according to the template (https://peerreviewcentral.com/index.php?page/general-guideline-for-authors) • Double spacing should be maintained throughout the table, including table headings • Table 3 must be contained within one page • All the abstract box should be in grey | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications | |
| Optional/General comments | ----- | |

PART 2:

| | 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) |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name: | Safae El Abkari |
| Department, University & Country | Mohammed V University, Morocco |