



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_12953
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of O6-Methylguanine in Cancer Patient Blood during Administration of Cyclophosphamide using Ultra High Performance Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry
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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) Mainly, this is a quantitation study. So, some details about the methods used should be given in abstract. 2) Authors gave some explanations about the accruing process for N7-methylguanine. But there is no result about this metabolite for the patients. Authors gave the results only for O₆-methylguanine, is this total amount of these metabolites?	1) Noted, corrected in the ABSTRACT, and marked. 2) Noted, corrected in the DISCUSSION 3.1, and marked.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Overall text should be read by a native English speaker. Because there are so many typographical and grammatical errors.	Noted. This paper has been submitted and corrected by American Journal Expert (AJE), and the certificate from them has been sent by email to JAMPS editor.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors say that in abstract; "The results of the study showed that O6-methylguanine is not always found in patients suffering from cancer treated with cyclophosphamide because there are so many factors that affect the formation of O6-methylguanine. The detected and quantitated O6-methylguanine can be a predictor of secondary cancer risk". This means that O ₆ -methylguanine is not a signicative predictor. Determination or detection of an another signicative predictor would be more interesting and valuable study for the cancer patients.	Noted, corrected in the abstract and marked.