

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Dental Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_77278
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE CEPHALOMETRIC EVALUATION OF MAXILLARY CENTRAL INCISOR CROWN ROOT RELATIONSHIPS IN VARIOUS MALOCCLUSIONS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The abstract does not specify the values of the results obtained and their significance.</p> <p>The section Material and methods do not indicate the number of examined cephalographies and their distribution according to the types of deformities. The first section Results describes the statistical methods used - this should be in the Section Methods.</p> <p>The whole section Results consists only of tables and graphs, the work of statistical processing. It is necessary to add their analysis and explanation by the authors themselves.</p> <p>There is a lot of material included in the discussion section, which in terms of meaning refers to the introduction. In this section it is important to discuss the significance of the results obtained by the authors and to compare with foreign results, how much they overlap or differ. Nowhere in the discussion are the values obtained from the analysis discussed, the reader must discover the differences himself.</p> <p>The section Conclusion is insignificant, every orthodontist knows this empirically. For screenshots, you can use a screenshot of the digital analysis you have done with different groups of patients.</p> <p>I recommend full review of the article's conception.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Greta Roussanova Yordanova-Kostova</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Medical University – Sofia, Bulgaria</b>