

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_89332
Title of the Manuscript:	ABT-263, an Inhibitor of Bcl-2 Family Antiapoptotic Proteins, Sensitizes Prometaphase-Arrested HeLa Cells to Apoptosis Induced by Mild Hyperthermia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><b>THE THEME</b> It's an interesting topic that really requires this kind of research.</p> <p><b>THE TITLE</b> “ABT-263, an inhibitor of Bcl-2 family anti-apoptotic proteins, sensitizes prometaphase-arrested HeLa cells to mild hyperthermia-induced apoptosis” Concise and precise</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b> it is well detailed rich in bibliographical references. The objective of the work is well described, so the author have examined the effects of mild hyperthermia on HeLa cells treated with ABT-263, a Bcl-2 inhibitor and other anti-apoptotic proteins.</p> <p><b>MATERIAL AND METHODS</b> This part seems well detailed and clear to me.</p> <p><b>RESULTS and DISCUSSIONS</b> The article needs to be further enriched in terms of discussion. It is especially necessary to make comparisons of the results obtained with other recent works.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION</b> The work lacks <b>conclusion!</b> the author must put a conclusion which must clearly show all the far points of his work also he must put perspectives and recommendations</p> <p><b>BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES</b> With 54 bibliographic references, the document is considered rich in bibliography, but this does not prevent the author from having to at least enrich the article with recent work.</p> <p><b>My decision on the article</b> <b>The article is accepted with Minor Revision</b></p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Boukerker Hassen
Department, University & Country	Center Scientific Research and Technical Sur Les Régions Aride, Algeria