

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_102866
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Estimation Models for Postmortem Interval using Total Body Score and Accumulated Degree Days for Different Geographical Regions
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript reviewed Total Body Score (TBS) from decomposition processes on the estimation of PMI in order for researcher around the world (in different regions) to have an idea on the suitable variable PMI models</p> <p>Title is suitable for the scope of content</p> <p>Abstract is not compact and comprehensive enough. There are only 114 words in abstract. There should at least be 200 words (or depends on the requirement of the journal)</p> <p>Yes, the paper started with methods of estimation PMI, the processes of body decomposition, different scoring for different regions of the body and different predictive models</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have noted the inconsistency of terminology in the content. Why is the word Postmortem is different from Post mortem? In the paper, the authors have written Postmortem Interval (PMI) but post mortem is spelled with a space in between. Yet sometimes, the word is read as 1 word.</p> <p>Similarly, the word ante mortem is sometimes appeared as 1 word (antemortem) and sometimes with a space in between (ante mortem).</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khoo Lay See
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Forensic Medicine, Hospital Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia