



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_5763
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of rodent pheromone genes: A review of the ABPs with comparison to the ESPs and MUPs
Type of the Article	Review

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		OK
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Overall, this text is well written (likely by Dr. Robert C Karn; I can't see the list of author(s)). The manuscript covers a wide range of studies done both by him/ themselves and others, and provides invaluable information for readers to understand evolution of rodent pheromone genes. It will definitely attract many readers in biological science. My only concern is that all the Figures were previously published (Karn and Laukaitis 2012, PLOSONE; Laukaitis & Karn R.C. 2012. In: Macholan M, Munclinger P, Baird SJ, Pialek J, eds. Evolution of the House Mouse, Published by Cambridge University Press 2012; etc.), and exactly copied from them. It is fine to reuse your own figures in a review paper. However, to clear yourself from possible self-plagiarism, please cite the reference at the end of each figure legend to indicate from where the figures adopted, which also makes it clear that this is a review paper, rather than an original work. I would also recommend the author(s) to rewrite all of the figure legends, making it more concise yet also less technical (several sentences of summary are enough).	OK (thank you) Yes, they were, and I have obtained permission for the use of each in this review. Actually, the citation to the original literature, along with the special note, where applicable, for BMC journals appear at the <u>beginning</u> of the figure legend. The one exception is Fig. 6 where the permission statement is at the end for style consistency. These are all highlighted in the revision in yellow as requested. Several of the longer legends were shortened to be more concise and less technical.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		OK