

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_125874
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CORRELATION BETWEEN FACIAL INDEX, ORBITAL WIDTH AND INTERCANTHAL DISTANCE IN ADULT IGBOS OF A NIGERIAN POPULATION</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This publication adds to human morphology and ethnic diversity research by providing anthropometric data on face indices, orbital width, and intercanthal distance in adult Igbo Nigerians. In craniofacial surgery, orthodontics, and forensic anthropology, population-specific anatomical data is vital for appropriate diagnosis, treatment, and identification. This publication helps us understand ethnic-specific facial proportions, which can improve medical care and cultural representation. However, clinical application research could boost its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Although it has room for improvement, the title appears to be suitable. Eg: Exploring the Correlation Between Facial Index, Orbital Width, and Intercanthal Distance in Igbo Adults of Nigeria	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Grammar can be improved. I have highlighted the areas where grammar can be rephrased.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Few important subsections are missing: 1. Conclusion is missing 2. Ethical approval no. is missing 3. Conflict of interest is missing 4. Pictures are missing	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript compares face index, orbital width, and intercanthal distance in Nigerian adult Igbos. This highlights the need for anthropometric studies to understand population-specific craniofacial differences that affect surgery and forensic identification. Focusing on Igbo ethnicity boosts local applicability. The study illuminates facial symmetry, attractiveness, developmental biology, ethnicity, and genetic variability by examining different facial features. If the sample size and methods are standardized, the conclusions are reliable and scientific.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	I think he should add few latest references; Eg; 1. Ejiwunmi AB, Sholaja OA, Alabi AS. Craniofacial anthropometry and facial indices of adult Nigerians of Yoruba ethnic group. Int J Morphol. 2022;40(3):693-701. doi:10.4067/S0717-95022022000300693. 2. Oludiran OO, Igbigbi PS. Anthropometric study of facial morphology and proportions among the Igbos of Nigeria. Afr Health Sci. 2021;21(3):1225-1234. doi:10.4314/ahs.v21i3.35. 3. Okeke UO, Agbara FN, Nwobi IC. Intercanthal distance, facial index, and other anthropometric measurements in Nigerian Igbos: A comparative study. J Craniofac Surg. 2023;34(1):e61-e66. doi:10.1097/SCS.0000000000008803.	

### Review Form 3

	<b>4. Udeh-Ezeh IE, Ani OE. Orbital parameters and facial dimensions in an adult Igbo population: A pilot study. Niger J Clin Pract. 2020;23(6):793-798. doi:10.4103/njcp.njcp500_19.</b>	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Enhancing grammatical accuracy and rephrasing pivotal sentences is essential for rendering the article appropriate for academic discourse. Here is his proposed approach:  <b>1. Focus on Clarity and Precision:</b> Scholarly writing should avoid vague terms and ensure that each sentence conveys its point clearly and concisely. Revise any ambiguous or overly complex sentences. <b>2. Correct Grammar and Sentence Structure:</b> Fix grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement, tense consistency, and misplaced modifiers. Ensure each sentence has a clear subject and predicate. <b>3. Use Formal Academic Tone:</b> Eliminate casual language, redundant expressions, and contractions. For instance, replace “a lot” with “a significant amount” or “many.” <b>4. Rephrase for Logical Flow:</b> Highlighted sentences should be rewritten for a more logical progression of ideas. Ensure that transitions between paragraphs are smooth.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Review the manuscript for grammatical corrections.	

### **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>Anil Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University, Oman</b>