

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_106968
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of Shapes of The Orbit with Various Age Groups by Using Plain Skull Radiographs: A 5-Year Retrospective Cross-Sectional Study in Northwestern Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>All research is relatively important in the field and context in which it is developed. For anthropometric purposes, of a particular population, it is important due to its local character.</p> <p>The title is too long. We propose: "Use of simple skull radiographs, in the correlation of orbital shapes in Nigeria"</p> <p>The writing is easy to understand, because it lacks complexities in the objective to be addressed.</p> <p>Complies with the established structure for scientific works.</p> <p>There are details that are pointed out in the revised document.</p> <p>The references are abundant and current with some classic works.</p> <p>The texts are developed in the document (introduction), as notes taken from the bibliography and not as a reflection of the topic by the author. This is detectable and reduces the quality of the exhibition. We suggest the author work better on the writing of those paragraphs.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is simple without academic complications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author made errors of imbalance in Table I, which causes serious situations in the reliability of the results and, likewise, what derives from it. Apparently he did not carry out an in-depth check and review before submitting the work to the magazine.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Remedios Hernández
Department, University & Country	Cuba