



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48754
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF GOLDEN PROPORTION, RECURRING ESTHETIC DENTAL PROPORTION AND GOLDEN PERCENTAGE IN HIMACHAL DEMOGRAPHIC
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://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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In this study, the widths of the anterior teeth of a population were analyzed on cast stone molds, and some specific ratios were checked, namely Golden Proportion, Recurring Esthetic Dental Proportion, and Golden Percentage. The main finding was that the ideal ratios did not concur and that this population had its unique ratios. It is an interesting study, but unfortunately is not well-edited, and has poor English language use. Below, the authors can find my comments for the article:</p> <p>Title --The word 'Comparative' is confusing in the title, as is not supported in the abstract.</p> <p>Abstract --The abstract is poorly written and does not reflect the manuscript content. --Abstract/Aim: RED; write openly at first use, then abbreviate. --Abstract/M&M: inclusion criteria? What are they? --Abstract/Results: Here, most of the content belongs to the M&M section. --Abstract/Results: Results about the RED proportion is given only. What about the other parameters? --Abstract/Conclusion: The content of the Results section does not support it.</p> <p>Main text --Mention the city also for commercial products --Measurements: Here, there is a critical mistake. Third and fourth sentences suggest that the golden proportion analyses are invalid. "The width of central incisors was taken as 62% of the value obtained and compared with the width of the adjacent lateral incisors. Similarly, the width of the lateral incisors was taken as 62% of the value obtained and compared with that of the canine." Instead, they should have been taken as 100 exactly, not 62 or 62%. The authors must reconsider their calculations. --Measurements: Regarding Golden Percentage: I can guess what the authors mean, but the calculation method is not described clearly. --Results: Mention the exact p values in the text. --Results: The Results section must communicate with the Tables and Graphs where necessary. --Conclusion: The third item is not valid. What the authors state in the third item applies to the previous two items as well. The third item should read something like this: ...ideal Golden Percentage values of 25%, 15%, and 10% were not found for the Himachal population.</p>	<p>All the necessary have been made and highlighted Thank you for your review and kindly let me know if there any other changes</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<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.