

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79825
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON GENE THERAPY
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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	<p>Gene Therapy, as a review, turns out to be interesting. However, it is not a good review of the topic.</p> <p>The document does not show a sequence. The authors should include a better classification of the vectors, including the group and the clinical application or its limitations or advantages. Classification of vectors: Adenovirus, Retrovirus, Adenoassociated, Lentivirus, Non-Viral Vectors Also, nothing is said about the different types of classifications of gene therapy, such as in what kind of cells, in vivo, ex vivo, gene replacement, gene addition. Its advantages or disadvantages are not mentioned Monogenic and multigene diseases should be mentioned in the applications of gene therapy. In the section on the risks of insertional mutagenesis, comment on tumorigenic events. Comment if the Methods for producing vectors in bioreactors are a limitation or the purification techniques and packaging in cell lines have already been improved. And finally, highlight that the studies are being carried out in India. I feel that this information is scattered in the document, but it does not give importance to its investigations, development, and new projects. The conclusion should mention where gene therapy is going, and its advantages</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-None of the figures or the table is mentioned or referred to in the text, as shown in figure 1 -If it is a review of the topic, it should include more references, which support where the information being displayed comes from. Perhaps the subject is not delved into depth because the study reference is not included. -English will have to be corrected further. It is not very well written, lacks punctuation, and has terrible writing. I include this comment at the end because that will be easier to correct with a person whose mother tongue is English. -Include more references and complete references 2 and 11 References 2. Zimmer C. DNA Double Take. The New York times 11. Davis J. Gene Therapies in Research: Overview.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In the safety and ethics section, highlight more the secondary effect of the immune response and give as an example the case of Jesse Gelsinger. J Gelsinger was the first person to die, he was treated with an adenoviral vector that carried the gene that counteracted his disease, given the highest dose. He died four days later, on September 17, <u>due to a strong immune response</u> caused by the use of the viral vector, which led to multi-organ failure and brain death. <u>This led the FDA to be more stringent on these protocols.</u> -Show a section that includes all the companies and laboratories that are participating. -And there, you can include new technologies such as nanomaterials. -Limited effects from animal models were not mentioned to predict the impact in human trials. -Comment briefly on Germline Transmission Vector sequences have been transiently detected in the semen of patients treated in AAV2 (Manno et al. 2006) or AAV8 (Nathwani et al. 2014) trials Manno CS, Pierce GF, Arruda VR, et al. (2006) Successful transduction of liver in hemophilia by AAV-factor IX and limitations imposed by host immune response. Nat Med 12: 3 Nathwani AC, Reiss UM, Tuddenham EG, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of factor IX gene therapy in hemophilia B. N Engl J Med. 2014; 371: 1994–2004.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Rosa Rincón-Sánchez
Department, University & Country	Guadalajara University, Mexico