



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_48754</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF GOLDEN PROPORTION, RECURRING ESTHETIC DENTAL PROPORTION AND GOLDEN PERCENTAGE IN HIMACHAL DEMOGRAPHIC</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 11: Results – I suggest to write the result about Golden Proportion and RED proportion.</p> <p>Line 13: I suggest Golden Proportion based on gender.</p> <p>Line 18: Conclusions – what about Golden Proportion and RED proportion?</p> <p>Line 60: How to measurements were obtained is not clear for me. I suggest that the authors have to be clearer.</p> <p>Line 82 – instead: Proportion based on sex, I suggest: Proportion based on gender.</p> <p>Line 148 – Instead: successive width of the maxillary anterior teeth in the population of Himachal Pradesh population, I suggest: successive width of the maxillary anterior teeth in the Himachal Pradesh population.</p> <p>Line 152 - I did not understand the third conclusion. I think the author could re-write to become clear.</p> <p>I think that the author should discuss more the results about 1,3 and 1,4 golden proportion where male and female presented discrepant results.</p>	All the asked corrections have been made and highlighted
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	I had taken the consents from the subjects and my study was ethically approved by the university.