



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_32463
Title of the Manuscript:	A SURVEY OF DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID
Type of the 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>After careful consideration of manuscript, I have determined that your findings may be of interest, but they are lot of typological errors. See the proper grammatical check up. Special arrangements must be proper</p> <p>For eg: Line No 35 and 37</p> <p>Most references in the introduction are fairly old; essential references seem to be lacking (2nd paragraph- ref no 21)</p> <p>Make clear all the sufficient information should be given in the tabular column (For eg: findings of Genetic information</p> <p>Mention the novelty and what basis the survey made by the author</p> <p>Image indent is missing, follow any one capital or small letter Fig – 1 or fig 1</p> <p>Overall manuscript is suitable for chapter not for journal, All the information in the manuscript was not structured well</p> <p>Fulfill all the journal requirements, proper tabulation, recent references and clearly precise the application for DNA testing</p>	<p>I humbly appreciate Reviewer's Observations and suggestions.</p> <p>Typological and grammatical errors have been corrected</p> <p>Error observed in line No. 35 and 37 have been corrected.</p> <p>During the course of revision of the manuscript, more recent references were have been added.</p> <p>Amended as observed</p> <p>More relevant information has been added.</p> <p>Observations noted, complied and recent references were added</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The discussion repeats a lot of the introduction</p> <p>Most references in the introduction are fairly old; essential references seem to be lacking</p> <p>It's unclear that the title and manuscript information is confusing</p> <p>Why the author entitled as survey</p> <p>Author reconstruct the manuscript properly in which there is no grammatical errors and give maximum reports and findings</p>	<p>Recent references added</p> <p>Manuscript properly checked for typographical and grammatical errors</p>