

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_97355
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON DNA PROFILING IN FORENSIC DENTISTRY
Type of the Article	Review

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)	ABSTRACT: needs to be completely rewritten INTRO - Where is the ref for (Goldman1985)? - In "DNA PROFILING", put the refs in crescent order ("3,4,1") - I suggest removing the subtopics METHODS: I suggest the authors include how they found the source to do this article DISCUSSION: I strongly recommend the authors include a discussion showing the current understanding about the topic.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-	
Optional/General comments	It is an interesting review. It does not have a solid methodology and is a simple review. Therefore, it is interesting and well-structured.	

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:	Gustavo Fernandes
Department, University & Country	University of Michigan School of Dentistry, USA