Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRB_45967**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Analysis of DNA damage biomarkers in human leukocytes by PAHs exposure.**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract **Aims**: To study the potential genotoxicity instead * was evaluated should be removed **Study design**; **: :*** Were using human leukocytes to the toxic cultures exposure to 24 hrs with different concentrations of anthracene, phenanthrene and benzo(a)pyrene* **should be rephrased to read** Human leukocytes were exposed to the toxic cultures with different concentrations of anthracene, phenanthrene and benzo(a)pyrene for 24 hours *Were considered in the experimental design four toxic test groups for each one PAHs, control group, analytic blank group and standard fluorescence group* **should be rephrased to be** Four toxic test groups, PAHs, control group, analytic blank group and standard fluorescence group were considered **Methodology**: Line 4: *First was evaluated lethal concentration with neutral red (NR50) assay for each one PAHs was obtained* **should be rephrased to be** *Firstly,the lethal concentrations with neutral red (NR50) assay for each one PAHs was obtained*. Line 5 :*After were used sublethal concentrations range of these toxics for both biomarkers*** be rephrased to be** *Then sublethal concentrations range of these toxics for both biomarkers were used* Line 6: *In case of DNA fragmentation was used a fluorochrome to mark DNA fragments and isolation with alkaline solution finally determined with fluorescence spectroscopy*** be rephrased to be**, *In the case of DNA fragmentation, a fluorochrome was used to mark DNA fragments and isolation with alkaline solution finally determined with fluorescence spectroscopy **Results**: Line 1: lethal cytotoxicity instead of* lethaly cytotoxic* **Conclusion** Line 5: * used as* instead *may be used as* Introduction Paragraph 2,Line 1: *The main source of PAHs in the air is the atmospheres of* instead of* is the air of the atmospheres* Paragraph 6, Line 1:*The World Health Organization (WHO) determined as limit of occupational exposure to B(a)P of 0.2 mg/m^{3*} **should be** *The World Health Organization (WHO) determined of 0.2 mg/m^3 as limit of occupational exposure to B(a)P* **2.3 Lethal cytotoxicity assay to ANT and BaP** Line 1: * Was applied the exposure for 24 h at 37° C* **should be rephrased to be** * Exposure for 24 hours at 37^0 C was applied* Line 2: What is NR? Line 4: *The fifty lethal cytotoxicity* **should be** *The fifty percent lethal cytotoxicity* **2.4 Determination of DNA fragmentation** **Line 1:** *Technique of fluorescence analysis of DNA unwinding (FADU) [15] was used for quantification of the fragments of DNA chain*** instead of** * For the quantification of the fragments of DNA chain was used the technique of fluorescence analysis of DNA unwinding (FADU) [15]* **2.5 Determination of adducts DNA-PAHs** Line 1: * they were re-suspended* instead of *they are re-suspended.	- Included correction in yellow - Included corrections in yellow of this section - Included corrections in yellow of this section - Included correction in yellow - Included corrections in yellow of this section

	Line 2: What is PBS? **3. RESULTS** Paragraph 3, Line1: *Table 1 presents* instead of *In the table 1* Also change * In the Table 3* to *Table 3 presents* Also change * In the figure 3* to * Figure 3 presents* Also change * In the figure 4* to * Figure 4 presents* **4. DISCUSSION** Line 1: lower cytotoxicity* instead of *lower citotoxicity* Paragraph 4, line 7: * while in the B(a)P if is present, this due high potential of ionization* be rephrased as *while in the B(a)P if is present, this is due high potential of ionization* Paragraph 7 line 4: * In the present study* instead of *As in the present study* Paragraph 8, Line 2: Cl ions **should be properly written as** chloride ions or Cl^- Line 7: * this in turn in the expression of damage genotoxic* be rephrased as *this in turn is the expression of genotoxic damage * Paragraph 9, Line 3: In considering that the level, *that* should be removed, Line 4: B(a)P and that the EC50, *that* should be removed Line 7: These compounds to produce reactive derivatives *to* should be removed Paragraph 9 line 4 :Similar at the present study *at* should be replaced by *to* Line 9: Said derivative.should be written as *The derivative* **5. CONCLUSIONS** Paragraph 2, line 2: may be used as genotoxicity assays are rapid, *may be* should be removed Paragraph3 line 1: Both DNA strand breaks and DNA-PAH adducts and analysis has been extensively used to evaluate the toxicity of PAHs. * has* to be replaced by *have*	- Included corrections in yellow of this section - Included corrections in yellow of this section - Included corrections in yellow of this section
Optional/General comments	The English in the manuscript has to be carefully read and corrected. There are a lot of mix up in the use of English. The article is interesting.	We greatly appreciate the review made of the manuscript and the valuable comments for the improvement of the work.

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)*	No applied