



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_30998
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of Phorbol 12-Myristate 13-Acetate on CD11b and CD62-L cell surface expression of neutrophils and monocytes.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In title: Delete the (.) at the end of title. - In abstract: Delete (,) before and in line (7) and line (12). - In introduction: In line (21) change (L, P, and, E selectins) into (L, P and E selectins). Delete (,) before and in line (24), apply this in all text. In line (24) change (L-selectin (or CD62-L)) into (L-selectin (CD62-L)). - In results The author have to put peak figures for the expression of CD62-L and CD11b on both PMNs and monocytes. The isolation methods are very old. Plagiarism issue: Please see the report.	With regards to the reviewer's comments all of the grammar and typographical errors have been amended accordingly (highlighted in yellow). With regards to flow cytometric analysis, peak MFI results have been emphasised in the results section (highlighted in yellow). The isolation methods employed during the study are primarily based on the work originally reported by Lennie et al (1987), and have subsequently been adapted by Dr SF Hughes (co-author) in subsequent studies (e.g. Hughes et al (2006). This method is reliable and reproducible and therefore was employed for the present study. With respect to the Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report, this was shown to be 15% (low plagiarism detected). The authors have re-read the work and are happy with the manuscript as is, and therefore no further changes have been made. At the University of Chester, turnitin is the plagiarism checker used to screen all works. Anything less than <20% is considered acceptable.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Thank you to the reviewer for their comments.