

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJMPCP_117681
Title of the Manuscript:	Discriminant Analysis for Sex and Stature Estimation using Arm and Forearm-Hand Length; A Study among Mgbidi population of Imo State Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript helps add a new dimension for stature estimation from arm and forearm lengths. The predictive power and analysis is vigorously explained. But its application would be restricted. In all a novel topic which has been studied in various demographic areas other than the area in study.</p> <p>2. Title appears to be appropriate.</p> <p>3. The various applications of this study have to be mentioned in the abstract. How this study will impact on the medical education, to whom this study will be important and how this information can be used clinically needs to be highlighted.</p> <p>4. Study period mentioned in materials and methods need to be corrected. Justification for age criteria i.e. only from 18-35 needs to be mentioned.</p> <p>In results the age criteria again changes as 18-37 needs to be corrected.</p> <p>Spelling mistakes in discussion.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and intelligently quoted and referred.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>One or two spelling mistakes need to be looked into, otherwise English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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:	<b>Pratik Khona</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gadag Institute of Medical Sciences, India</b>