

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83003
Title of the Manuscript:	CONDYLAR HEIGHT: AGE AND SEX DETERMINATION USING ORTHOPANTOGRAM IN FORENSICS
Type of the 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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Pay critical attention to your abstract, and note that it conveys all relevant details of the main paper. (1) The first paragraph should draw the attention of readers to the title of the paper (2) give a clear meaning of what condylar height is and why it need to the studied. State one or two justifications. Tell your readers why this work is unique and different from existing findings.</p> <p>The methodology is not sufficient without:</p> <p>2. What type of research did the author carried?</p> <p>3. Where (country and locations of institutions and respondents)</p> <p>4. Justify why you chose these sample size</p> <p>5. What criteria was used to select the respondents (or tell readers why you think these respondents are suitable)</p> <p>6. Under what condition did you exclude other possible or potential respondents (is it because they do not fall within the age bracket ? they do not work in those hospitals , or they were located in a different state , or some of them are not directly involved the activities)</p> <p>7. Talk about the statistical technique you applied and justify why it was appropriate.</p> <p>8. If possible state the limitation of this research method.</p> <p>9. All these comments are meant to improve the quality of this paper.</p> <p>10. The result is not sufficient. Evaluating your result using standard deviation, and standard error is way below average. What other parameters are there? Could you not have reported with other parameters?</p> <p>11. In any case if your aim is to find out the determinants of condylar height in female/women , I suggest you state your research aim and questions clearly in the introduction and mention same in the abstract (the introduction line of the abstract)</p> <p>12. Again the conclusion should be linked to the title, condylar height: age and sex determination using orthopantogram in forensics.</p> <p>13. what is new , what did you discover ? state the points clearly.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Further comments can be found in the main manuscript (track changes)	
Optional/General comments	Further comments can be found in the main manuscript (track changes)	

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:	Peter Yao Lartey
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Uberlândia (UFU), Brasil