

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Blood Research &amp; Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IBRR_95432</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>'State of the art' of cytochrome P450 (CYP) induction assays- The current industry standards</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalibr.com/index.php/IBRR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>I am not familiar with other “state of the art” reviews of the methods for CYP induction assays, and thus believe this review fairly well covers these methods, at least in a general sense without getting into the molecular studies, etc. So, the scientific community may well be interested in this ms. for its review of these methods and potential problems and possibilities for future research.</p> <p>This is a review of the current research possibilities, and not a review of “industry standards” so much as it is a review of research techniques and issues (those may be industry standards, but the pharmaceutical industry is not necessarily <u>doing</u> the research); those standards are not well addressed. I suggest omitting the last half of the title and sticking with a review of state of the art for these CYP induction assay methods.</p> <p>The abstract is good; however, it, like the rest of the ms., refers to potential nuclear methods or new drugs, but the authors do not explain that issue thoroughly. Stick to a review of what’s going on now in this body of research, what works/doesn’t work, and the drug and individual health complications for the research. IN the conclusion, they might refer to potential, but that is not the focus of the ms., which is on current methods and accompanying issues.</p> <p>The ms. is a review and the points made in discussing the various methods/studies appear to be correct.</p> <p>Some statements seem to need citations, e.g., a discussion of methods and issues in several sentences has a citation at the end, when it appears that each factor ought to be cited. Also, some text difference between the overall writing and a sentence that is cited may indicate that the sentence came directly or nearly so from its source and should be in quotation marks, e.g., “Ex vivo assays are investigations or measurements performed in or on tissue from a species in an environment that is different from its natural condition with minimal changes to the environmental factors [52].” And there are other such cited statements that have no errors in English, while the body of the ms. has numerous errors, lexicon issues, etc.; the author/s should check their references/citations/direct quotations carefully to avoid errors</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The body of the ms. needs English grammar/lexicon/structure editing. While it’s readable, there are numerous errors in subject-verb agreement, word choice, sentence construction, etc. that make understanding some sections difficult.</p> <p>Also, the paragraphs need to be adjusted so that each paragraph focuses on one issue. The various methods, drug complications, and other CYP issues are densely packed, and that makes reading and comprehension difficult. I suggest cutting most paragraphs in half or thirds to focus on specific factors involved in this research.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This ms. appears to be a serious, well researched, and important ms. that needs a good English editor to help make it more comprehensible. Reviews of “state of the art” in research that studies diseases and complications of drugs are very important to the medical and pharmaceutical communities, since most of the researchers do not have time to do the background research in “what’s going on” in their fields beyond their particular foci. This ms. will help them to learn about those research projects. Also, the ms. mainly covers what appear to be Asian research projects; much similar research is ongoing in Europe, South America, and North America. So, while the ms. covers a lot of methods, it may not be complete. That limitation should be acknowledged.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anne Bliss</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile</b>