



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
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 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>	
Minor REVISION comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>S. Mustaq Ahammed</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Human Genetics, Bharathiar University, India</i>