

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_AJMPCP_117681</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Discriminant Analysis for Sex and Stature Estimation using Arm and Forearm-Hand Length; A Study among Mgbidi population of Imo State Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article in question is indeed quite important for the scientific community, provided that it is revised and free of the apparent errors it possesses. Apart from that, the work is, in my opinion, quite unique and worthy of scientific attention.</li> <li>2. The title of the paper should be “Discriminant Analysis and Multiple Linear Regression for Sex and Stature Estimation using Upper Arm and Forearm-Hand Length; A Study among Mgbidi population of Imo State Nigeria”.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound and the design of the study is correct.</li> <li>6. The given references are sufficient and recent.</li> <li>7. In the study, two separate instances of studied age groups are different from each other. One is 18-35 years of age and the other is 18-37 years of age.</li> <li>8. The author should post a citation corroborating his definition of arm length, since both the illustration and the definition seems to be descriptive of upper arm length rather than arm length.</li> <li>9. The study conducts both multiple linear regression analysis and discriminant analysis but does not inform the reader as to whether there is any collinearity between the variables taken, which if present, would render both models inappropriate. The author should revise and illustrate whether the collinearity between the predictor variables is within acceptable limits.</li> <li>10. The study claims that forearm-hand length has 99.5% accuracy in predicting sex and arm length has 2% accuracy while no tabulation and calculation of accuracy is shown. Discriminant analysis does not show accuracy in its prediction of classification but instead shows sensitivity and specificity. The author should explain as to how they arrived at the aforementioned figures.</li> <li>11. The study reports no statistically significant asymmetry in both arm length and forearm-hand length in either sex yet posits “right asymmetry” shows higher predictive power in females. The terminologies here is jumbled up and needs further clarification and revision. If the author, in the above instance, means right arm variables predict stature more robustly in females than males, the mention of “asymmetry” is incorrect.</li> <li>12. Conclusions and discussions of the study are contingent on “asymmetry” while tautological terminologies like “right and left asymmetry” are used. The author needs to clarify and revise their terminology in this regard.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language quality in this article is suitable for scholarly communications.</li> <li>2. Although instances of inappropriate in-text citations need to be corrected.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Ashish Mukherjee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Acharya Prafulla Chandra College, India</b>