



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_48739
Title of the Manuscript:	Cell death and its different modes: history of understanding and current trends
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The manuscript looks like that it has been copied from a library dissertation, kindly write it in a form of an article.</li> <li>2) I would like to elaborate the applied aspects of cell death, kindly write about the cancer mechanism where apoptosis fails.</li> <li>3) Write the mechanism of cytotoxic drugs and chemotherapy pertaining to the cell death.</li> <li>4) Write about the Immunohistochemical markers to check apoptosis.</li> <li>5) Write about mechanism of necrosis in various diseases.</li> <li>6) Write about the different genes regulate the cell death.</li> <li>7) Cite some articles from sciencedomain publications.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The reviewer is right to some extent as this article was the development of my work during doctoral studies in cell biology. The article has been revised accordingly.</li> <li>2) I kindly refuse because there are thousands of cancer resistance-associated publications, and this article was to be different. Mechanisms of resistance are reviewed in our another publication which is currently submitted elsewhere. In general, resistance to cell death is the hallmark of cancer. As other reviewer has suggested, almost all the aspects of cancer were removed from here after revision.</li> <li>3) Briefly, all toxicities lie on the extensive DNA damage. Even ROS elevation eventually causes DNA breaks. DNA damage-response is the key mechanism of cell death induction. Please refer to our previous publication for more information - <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812522-9.00004-X">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812522-9.00004-X</a> ("Adult stem cells and anticancer therapy").</li> <li>4) In response, some markers of apoptosis were introduced into section "The 20<sup>th</sup> century":                      "...DNA-ladder" as a result of inter-nucleosomal DNA degradation, and also activation of cysteine proteases caspases, were considered as obligate markers of apoptotic cell death. Some other immunohistochemical markers included cleaved cytokeratin-18, cleaved caspase-3, cleaved lamin A, phosphorylated histone H2AX, cleaved poly(ADP ribose) polymerase, and translocation of apoptosis-inducing factor AIF [12]."</li> <li>5) Regulated necrosis is described in the review of NCCD 2018 in detail. Short description was introduced into Table 3:                      "Mitochondrial permeability transition (MPT)-driven necrosis RCD triggered by perturbations of the intracellular microenvironment (severe oxidative stress and Ca overload) and relying on peptidylprolyl isomerase F. [42]                      Necroptosis A modality of RCD triggered by perturbations of extracellular or intracellular homeostasis that critically depends on MLKL, RIPK3, and (at least in some settings) on the kinase activity of RIPK1.[43]"</li> <li>6) I kindly refuse as that would be not original, and would double the volume of this article. Many such articles are published elsewhere. It is not the subject of current article.</li> <li>7) I looked through the publications and did not find a good match for citing in this review. Supposedly, the search platform for sciencedomain should be improved. There was one review which drew my attention Article no.AJBGMB.42398 but citing it in cell death context would be apparently forced.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		We thank the Reviewer for the evaluation of our manuscript. The suggestions may have improved its quality.



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	