

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_127184
Title of the Manuscript:	Anthropometric Analysis of External Ear Shape and Earlobe Attachment Patterns in the Hausa Ethnic Group of Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The authors provided information regarding earlobe attachment and auricle types of individuals from Hausa ethnic group of Nigeria	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 figures should be properly cited in the text. For Taro Yamane formula the authors should provide a reference in the text. How many participants were excluded from the study according to exclusion criteria stated? For a $p = 0.002$ the authors should state $p < 0.05$, not $p > 0.05$. The discussion should be improved. The authors stated results of other studies in the literature but they did not present anything about the possible reasons for the differences in the literature apart from genetic, race and environmental factors which should be provided in detail. In the current form of the discussion, it is not clear what happens depending on the aforementioned factors. This should at least be clarified with some examples in relation to literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

Major REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The figures should be properly cited in the text. For Taro Yamane formula the authors should provide a reference in the text. How many participants were excluded from the study according to exclusion criteria stated? For a $p = 0.002$ the authors should state $p < 0.05$, not $p > 0.05$. The discussion should be improved. The authors stated results of other studies in the literature but they did not present anything about the possible reasons for the differences in the literature apart from genetic, race and environmental factors which should be provided in detail. In the current form of the discussion, it is not clear what happens depending on the aforementioned factors. This should at least be clarified with some examples in relation to literature.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be revised accordingly.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cagatay Barut
Department, University & Country	Istanbul Medeniyet University, School of Medicine, Turkey