

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83260
Title of the Manuscript:	AGE ESTIMATION USING MANDIBULAR PROJECTIVE RAMUS HEIGHT - A RETROSPECTIVE DIGITAL ORTHOPANTOMOGRAPHIC STUDY
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the present study, the authors present research concern to age estimation using mandibular projective ramus height. In my opinion, the linear regression used to these studies is not adequate.</p> <p>As you know, the mandible has the greatest morphological changes in size and remodelling during growth in childhood. Apart from that, growth rate of the mandible is stunted in mature age, but the size of the mandible may decrease in old age. So the growth rate is strong nonlinear in whole life. Therefore, the authors should explain why they use linear not nonlinear regression to age estimate with morphological dimensions of the mandible.</p> <p>Also, they should discuss limitation of the linear regression formula derived using mean mandibular projective ramus height for age estimation. The formula in all age groups shows significant decrease in mandibular projective ramus height in males and females as the age advances with deviation about +/- 7 years. Is it accurate enough?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The authors omitted one figure: Mandibular projective ramus height (AB) of female measured using planmeca software.</p> <p>The list of figure legends includes two figures Figure 1 and Figure 2 for both male and female measurements.</p> <p>In addition, the authors provide different accuracy values in the article. For example: in Material and Methods the precision is 70%, but in Results and Conclusion the accuracy is 65%. Please use only real accuracy.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This manuscript should be improved scientifically and technically according to the above remarks before being published.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Wojciech Wolański
Department, University & Country	Silesian University of Technology, Poland