



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.	
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.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paola Maycotte
Department, University & Country	Biomedical Research Center of East IMSS , Mexico