



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_24279
Title of the Manuscript:	FANCONI ANEMIA GENES AND REACTIVE OXYGEN SPECIES IN CANCER DEVELOPMENT
Type of the Article	Review paper

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The present review article has certainly some merits and includes interesting observations. However, I have a major concern. In the present for the article is more a historical perspective rather than a review. The author(s), who certainly gave a significant contribution to the field, should describe their own findings together with the other independent ones in a more objective manner. Further, the article needs a language revision and mistyping correction (the first sentence in the abstract apparently misses the verb etc).	I agree with all Reviewer' comments and took them into account in MS revised copy. As for the comment about our own findings, they included in the text. I believed that they are still of some interest because subsequent works especially about the use of flavonoids for fighting FA are of importance. Unfortunately, we were unable to continue our studies.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		