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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript offers a thorough anatomical and morphometric analysis of skull base foramina, which hold considerable clinical importance in neurosurgery, radiology, and forensic anthropology. Comprehending the differences in these foramina aids in improved preparation for skull base surgeries and preventing iatrogenic harm. The research further enriches the understanding of racial and regional anatomical variations, which can guide medical training and clinical practice. Therefore, the manuscript is very significant for anatomists, clinicians, and surgical trainees |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | For improved clarity , authors may consider a slightly modified title: "Anatomical and Morphometric Study of Human Skull Base Foramina: Clinical and Forensic Implications |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract should be comprehensive and must Include specific data points or key findings (e.g., mean diameters, frequency of variations). Explicitly state the significance or implications of the study in the concluding line. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. The objectives are clear, the methodology is appropriate, and results are systematically presented.However, a few clarifications are needed: Clarify inclusion/exclusion criteria for the skull samples. Mention the age range of the skulls, if known, as it may affect foraminal dimensions. Provide statistical analysis details (e.g., confidence intervals, significance thresholds) |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references are generally relevant, but some recent studies (post-2020) on skull base morphometry and 3D imaging techniques are missing. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the language is generally clear and comprehensible. However, a few grammatical and typographical errors are present that require minor editing |  |
| Optional/General comments | Including a brief section on clinical correlations (e.g., nerve compression syndromes, radiological identification) would add value. |  |
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