

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_100955</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Morphometric Assesment of Bi-Caudate Index Using Computerized Tomographic Scan From Sokoto North-Western Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>The manuscript focuses in an interesting subject. The sample (of 186 individuals) is satisfying. The methodology that has been followed is scientifically supported.</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, it provides in a few sentences the aim of this research, the methodology, the results and the conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, references are sufficient enough and mainly recent (there are just two before 1980, but also six after 2003).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. The text is understandable and well structured.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the manuscript are suggested a few spelling corrections. In the attachment file have been highlighted the words that need corrections.</li> <li>- In Figure 2, is not clear what is depicted in the red coloured diagram. Probably the blue one shows the mean values of BCI in males. Is suggested the authors to check that. Besides, is suggested to be mentioned a title for the vertical axe.</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nikolaos E. Tsiatis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Greece</b>