

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)	Yes. With the advent of technology, forensic odontology is gaining a lot of popularity, as a reliable method for identification and as a field of study. A comprehensive history is presented in a tabular format which is easy to comprehend for the users. Various sources and types of DNA are provided which can be used for identification. The article is comprehensive and even covers the drawbacks of DNA profiling in forensic odontology. Yes. But could be more comprehensive. Yes. Yes. Yes. There are a few formatting errors. However, I believe that this could be due to different versions of Microsoft office being used.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Line 22: grammatical error. Replace "were" with "where"	

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:	Oshin Verma
Department, University & Country	College of Dental Sciences and Research Centre, India