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	The text does not contain the abbreviations PHEN, ANT, and so on. Perhaps this means: Antrhacene, Phenanthrene and Benzo (a) pyrene solutions. There is no indication of the reliability of the differences in the tables (p-value). There is no description of the number of measurements of the experiment. All tables and charts do not contain a note on the statistical processing method and characteristics of the sample. In this regard, their interpretation is incomprehensible: there is neither a method nor a description of what the authors wanted to present. Incorrect statistical analysis of the results, since there is no calculation of the significance of differences and a description of the method. Only Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD) values are given, which is not enough for reliable scientific results and conclusions, and therefore the conclusions look untenable. In the figures there is no standard deviation, the reliability of differences is not clearly marked, we have to guess which column it belongs to. Materials and methods are described poorly, which makes reproduction difficult. There are links to articles where these methods are used, but they do not give a proper idea of the method. The findings reflect the ways in which the knowledge gained is used as a biomarker, which is not novel (for example, this is shown in reference №17 for 1997). In addition, the conclusions should be written more abstractly and reflect the real results of this author's manuscript.	- Were included the acronyms in yellow - Were included the p-value in yellow - Were included the number measurements in yellow - Were included the statistical test in yellow - Were included the statistical differences in yellow - The figures are included the description of the statistical differences between groups. - Were included the corrections in yellow - Were included the statistical differences
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)*	