SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJRRD_67708**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Investigation of Root-Crown Ratio of Upper Anterior Teeth in a Group of Turkish Children**
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/journal/10/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		
Minor REVISION comments	1) It will be better to change the title to (Upper Incisors) instead of (Upper Anterior Teeth) or add the upper canine into the teeth evaluation to be complete upper anterior teeth. 2) What about the peg shaped lateral, did you exclude it in your research or not? Clarify this point. 3) Write few lines to describe the Image J program you used in your paper. 4) Change the word of Children all over the manuscript into Adolescent.	1) The title changed to (Upper Incisors) instead of (Upper Anterior Teeth). 2) Shape anomalies including peg shaped lateral was excluded in our research. 3) The description has been added in the paper. 4) The word of Children changed all over the manuscript into Adolescent.
Optional/General comments	1) Did you make a pilot study or intra or inter observer calibration to check the accuracy of the observer? if you did them, you can write some points. 2) Can you clarify by few lines why you describe your data as retrospective? 3) What is the criteria of dim light you used? Usually the radiographic examinations done on X-ray viewer.	1) Investigators didn't make pilot study or calibration. 2) No new x-rays were taken from the patients for this study. Old x-rays were used. 3) Usually the radiographic examinations done on X-ray viewer but It is much more useful to make radiographic measurements under dim light

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	No ethical approval was obtained from the local ethical committee since only the achieve data were used for the study.