

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	JournalofAdvancesin MedicineandMedicalResearch
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JAMMR_125874
TitleoftheManuscript:	CORRELATIONBETWEENFACIALINDEX,ORBITALWIDTHHANDINTERCANTHALDISTANCEINADULTIGBOSOFANIGERIANPOPULATION
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback (Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportanceofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo youlike (ordislike)thismanuscript?Aminimumof 3-4 sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.	ThestudyprovidesvaluabledataonfacialanthropometryintheIgbopopulation. Itcontributes to understanding ethnicvariationsandhasimplicationsforforensicscienceandfacialsurgeries. Futureresearchcouldexploretherelationshipbetweenfacialanthropometryandgeneticfactors.	
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	The title is suitable. It clearly states the main focus of the study, which is the correlation between facial index, orbital width, and intercanthal distance in adult Igbos.	
Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Doyou suggesttheaddition(ordeletion)of somepointsinthis section?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.	The abstract is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the background, methods, results, and conclusions of the study. However, I would suggest adding a brief statement about the clinical or forensic implications of the findings. This would highlight the practical significance of the research and make it more appealing to a wider audience. For example, you could add a sentence like: "The findings of this study have potential applications in forensic science, facial reconstruction, and orthodontics, as they provide valuable information about the facial structure of the Igbo population."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate.	
Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingthescientific correctnessofthismanuscript.Whydoyouthinkthat thismanuscriptisscientificallYROBUSTANDTECHNICALLY sound?Aminimumof 3-4sentencesmayberequired forthispart.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It employs appropriate methods, an analysis, and presents findings clearly. The discussion provides a thorough interpretation.	
Aretherferencesufficientandrecent?If youhave suggestionsofadditionalreferences,pleasemention theminthereviewform.	The references appear to be sufficient and recent, supporting the claims made in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISIONcomments Isthe language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution. It provides valuable data and insights.	

[ReviewForm3](#)

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:	Abdulwahab Ismail Al-kholani
Department, University & Country	21 September University for Medical and Applied Science, Yemen