



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this manuscript, the authors review the history and the different versions of the manuscripts by the Committee on Cell Death. Some modifications need to be done before the manuscript can be accepted for publication. A definition of the types of cell death mentioned along the review needs to be clearly established. Thus, the authors need to include either sections describing the different types of cell death or a table with clear definitions of each one of them. In general, the paper is well written but it needs English proofreading by a native English speaker.	We thank the Reviewer for valuable suggestions. The table with cell death mode definitions is included in the revised manuscript. We recognize and regret that our English does not meet the standards.
Minor REVISION comments	The authors should avoid general statements, such as: our knowledge about... looks great (Line 31) A relationship between the statement in lines 40-43 to cell death according to scientific committees is not valid. The authors state that: ". It is interesting that according to such scientific studies even Catholic Church – after almost 2000 years – updated their teaching about human life and its conception, defining the death of a human zygote – a single cell – as death of a human person, in 1974 [5]." If the catholic church defined this concept in 1974, how can it be according to studies published in 2018? If the authors are referring to studies published in the 70's, they should clearly state it and make sure that the catholic church's manuscript is really based on Schweichel and Merker reference. On lines 48-49, the authors state that: "the mechanisms which suppress naturally-programmed cell death, may grant us the knowledge how to extend our lives". Looks like the authors assume that an organism dies because all of their cells suddenly die and this is not true. An organism dies because of organ failure that is not necessarily caused by all the organ undergoing cell death. Table lacks references, some lines do not have any reference. The authors should add one more column with the title References where each reference is clearly marked. ROS, cancer and cell death section is disconnected from the rest of the manuscript. The authors need to link this section to the rest of the manuscript or remove it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript was revised according to the suggestions. The paragraph was restructured and looks like this now: "...Starting from three types of cell death (type I, II and III) in 1970's [1], cell death has been gaining interest at an increasing rate. Regulated cell death (RCD) or the events that resemble it have been also observed in the organisms of plant and fungi kingdoms, even in unicellular eukaryotes and prokaryotes [2][3][4]. However, many more cell death subtypes, as defined by cellular morphology, cell function and biochemical markers, had been identified in the past fifty years. Nomenclature Committee on Cell Death (NCCD) has named already twelve cell death forms with the canonical types of apoptosis, autophagy and necrosis among them, in 2018. ..." Apparently, an organ fails due to enhanced cell death (e.g. in brain) and not sufficient cellular regeneration (e.g. blood). The reviewer is right that such process is not sudden, but neither we do state so. There are parallel views on this topic. In this article, we do not discuss the death at an organ/ organism level. But the sentence is corrected for to remove discrepancies. <p>"...may grant us the knowledge how to extend our lives. On one hand, extensive cell death leads to organ malfunction; on the other hand, cellular life can be artificially prolonged. Moreover, progress is needed in dealing with immortal or cell death-resistant cells, e.g. in human cancers..."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 3 is introduced for the similar purpose on the request of other reviewer. The section "ROS, cancer and cell death" was removed.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No.