



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
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 (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	<p>1. In Abstract – on line 5 instead "Fanconi Anemia (FA), an autosomal recessive disease of childhood.", " Fanconi Anemia (FA) is an autosomal recessive disease of childhood." should be written.</p> <p>2. In Abstract – on line 6 instead "It has been also demonstrated that Fanconi anemia, an only human genomic instability syndrome is very..." – "It has been also demonstrated that FA, an only human genomic instability syndrome, is very..." should be written.</p> <p>3. In Abstract – on line 10, 11, 14 and 15 instead "Fanconi anemia" – FA should be written.</p> <p>4. In Abstract – on line 10, 11, 14 and 15 instead "reactive oxygen species" – ROS should be written.</p> <p>5. In Key words – on line 16 instead ROS – "reactive oxygen species" should be written.</p> <p>6. In introduction on line 21 instead "the other cancers" - "other cancers" should be written.</p> <p>7. In introduction on line 24 instead "...Fanconi anemia because FA..." – "FA because it" should be written.</p> <p>8. On line 41 instead "bone marrow" –</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>bone marrow should be written.</p> <p>9. On line 43 instead ‘We have shown that both flavonoids were the most...’ – ‘We had shown that both flavonoids were the most...’ should be written.</p> <p>10. On line 45 instead “(This work had a good response; at present, it has been cited more than 800 times).” – ‘This work has been cited more than 800 times at present.’ should be written.</p> <p>11. On line 49 instead “Superoxide dismutase (SOD)” – SOD should be written.</p> <p>12. From line 50 to 54 the sentences “(Later on, we also demonstrated that rutin was a strong inhibitor of iron-dependent lipid peroxidation of rat brain homogenates [8] and the free radical formation in iron-overloaded rats [9]. Moreover, we found that rutin efficiently inhibited free radical formation and oxyhemoglobin oxidation in β-thalassemic red blood cells [10]) “ – without parentheses should be written.</p> <p>13. On lines 54-55 instead “rutin (vitamin P)” – rutin should be written.</p> <p>14. On lines 56-58 instead “Rutin (vitamin P) was permitted for application to patients (FA patients were under the supervision of our co-authors medical doctors). No toxic side effects were observed in patients.” – Rutin was permitted for application to FA patients under the supervision of our co-authors medical doctors. No toxic side effects were observed.”</p> <p>15. On line 91 instead “affected” – affects should be written.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>16. On line 127 instead “The antioxidants NAC and quercetin...” – “The antioxidants N-acetylcysteine (NAC) and quercetin...” should be written.</p> <p>17. On line 137 instead “Rutin is a nontoxic compound (vitamin P) permitted for ...” – “Rutin is a nontoxic compound permitted for...” should be written.</p> <p>18. On line 142 instead “We were happy to find...” - We were satisfied to find...” should be written.</p> <p>19. On line 215-216 instead “Taking into account the above-mentioned consideration, these ways might be presented as follows:” - “Taking into account the above-mentioned consideration, these ways have been presented in Table 1.”</p> <p>20. The sentences of Conclusions have need of predicates: Instead “(1) Direct interaction of FANCA and FANCF with ROS (superoxide) to form a complex...” – “(1) Direct interaction of FANCA and FANCF with ROS (superoxide) forms a complex...” Instead “(3) FANCD2 ubiquitination following the formation of FA-BRG1-promoter complex capable of...” – “(3) FANCD2 ubiquitination follows the formation of FA-BRG1-promoter complex capable of...” should be written. Instead “(4) Antioxidant activity of FA genes enhanced by the interaction with...” – “(4) Antioxidant activity of FA genes has been enhanced by the interaction with...” should be written. Instead “(5) Application of antioxidants and free radical scavengers (quercetin and NAC) to decrease ROS...” – “(5) Application of antioxidants and free radical scavengers (quercetin and NAC) decreases ROS...” should be written.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	
Optional/General comments	This multidisciplinary review paper is very interesting. It is a good example of personal authors' studies supported by contemporary data of other studies in these fields. The discussed problems are based on fundamental biochemical, pathophysiological and genetical aspects and have concrete therapeutical contribution. The style of writing is clear, no significant grammatical and styling proposals are mentioned above (in minor revision commenys). The references involve appropriate sources (from last 3 decades) including enough contemporary data and had been cited correctly.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Galya Ivanova Gancheva
Department, University & Country	Department of Infectious Diseases, Medical University, Bulgaria