



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_47410
Title of the Manuscript:	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUNK LEG RATIO AND PEAK EXPIRATORY FLOW RATE IN 200 LEVEL MBBS/BDS STUDENTS OF BAYERO UNIVERSITY KANO.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title:</b> need a revision.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Too long, should limit according to standard.</li> <li>2. Background is too long. Objective of study was not mentioned clearly.</li> <li>3. Analysis should be done by gender.</li> <li>4. Conclusion may differ once objective is clearly stated and further analysis.</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some paragraph is not relevant to the study. Significant of the study must be mentioned clearly.</li> </ol> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information such as selection criteria, ethics approval and anthropometric measures were not presented.</li> </ol> <p><b>Results and discussion:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analysis for between gender should be done, therefore results and discussion should be more relevant.</li> <li>2. Overall discussion is not in depth, too general and some are not related.</li> </ol> <p><b>Limitations of the study:</b> please highlight this</p> <p><b>Conclusion and recommendation:</b> Please re do according to gender differences.</p> <p><b>General comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please see attachment for detailed comments.</li> <li>2. Please check typo errors as indicated in the attachment.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Title:</b> need a revision.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Reduced to 300 words</li> <li>6. Reduced.</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <p>corrected</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. presented</li> </ol> <p><b>Results and discussion:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. corrected</li> </ol> <p>gender different is not needed .</p> <p><b>General comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. corrected.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>This article has no evidence that ethics approval has been obtained, since sample are human subjects, therefore it is necessary to obtain one.</p>	Yes there is both consent and ethical approval for the study. Find attached