SDI Review Form 1.6

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	1. Abstract not properly written and some sentence may create misleading information. 2. Acronym BaP or B(a)P. Please standardize the writing style. 3. Introduction: a) Some of points are repeated. b) Most of the highlighted sentence in literature review are not clearly described and written. c) "HNO_3 and NO_2" must be written as nitric acid, HNO_3 and nitrogen dioxide, NO_2. d) There is lack of continuity between one paragraph to next paragraph. e) Citation in text not properly written (Mendoza-Figueroa et al., 1985) 3. Material and methods a) The title for 2.1 shall be written as chemical only b) Acronym ANTstand for? c)The concentration for 3 compounds can be written in range. Need to emphasize why got difference between BaP concentration with the other two. d) Please mention on cell density used for each test. e) pH for NaOH? f) All samples were withdrawn with the culture medium: volume of sample? Cell density? 4. Result: a) table 1: blanco,testigo? b) there is no statistical difference: the author did not mention statistical test used for comparing the 2 compounds. c)Table 1 and 2 shall be merged into 1 since data BaP is similar. 5. Discussion: a) repeated paragraph 6. Conclusion a) Need to emphasize the difference between 3 compounds in term of genotoxicity	1.- Included corrections in yellow of this section 2.- Included corrections in yellow of this section 3.- Introduction: a) Paragraphs deleted in yellow b) Included corrections in yellow c) Included corrections in yellow d) Paragraphs deleted in yellow e) Included correction in yellow 3.- Material and methods: a) Included corrections in yellow b) Included acronym in yellow c) Included corrected in yellow d) Included in yellow e) Included in yellow f) Included in yellow 4. a) Included corrections in yellow b) Included corrections in yellow c Included Table 1 modified 5. a) Included corrections in yellow 6. a) Included corrections in yellow
Optional/General comments	Consider for English checking/proofreading	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