



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	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Aims: To study the potential genotoxicity instead * was evaluated should be removed</p> <p>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</p> <p>*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</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>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*.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Results: Line 1: lethal cytotoxicity instead of* lethaly cytotoxic*</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Line 5: * used as* instead *may be used as*</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Paragraph 2, Line 1: *The main source of PAHs in the air is the atmospheres of* instead of* is the air of the atmospheres*</p> <p>Paragraph 6, Line 1: *The World Health Organization (WHO) determined as limit of occupational exposure to B(a)P of 0.2 mg/m³* should be *The World Health Organization (WHO) determined of 0.2 mg/m³ as limit of occupational exposure to B(a)P*</p> <p>2.3 Lethal cytotoxicity assay to ANT and BaP</p> <p>Line 1:</p> <p>* Was applied the exposure for 24 h at 37° C* should be rephrased to be *</p> <p>Exposure for 24 hours at 37° C was applied*</p> <p>Line 2: What is NR?</p> <p>Line 4: *The fifty lethal cytotoxicity* should be *The fifty percent lethal cytotoxicity*</p> <p>2.4 Determination of DNA fragmentation</p> <p>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]*</p> <p>2.5 Determination of adducts DNA-PAHs</p> <p>Line 1: * they were re-suspended* instead of *they are re-suspended.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 2: What is PBS?</p> <p>3. RESULTS</p> <p>Paragraph 3, Line1: *Table 1 presents* instead of *In the table 1*</p> <p>Also change * In the Table 3* to *Table 3 presents*</p> <p>Also change * In the figure 3* to * Figure 3 presents*</p> <p>Also change * In the figure 4* to * Figure 4 presents*</p> <p>4. DISCUSSION</p> <p>Line 1: lower cytotoxicity* instead of *lower citotoxicity*</p> <p>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*</p> <p>Paragraph 7 line 4: * In the present study* instead of *As in the present study*</p> <p>Paragraph 8, Line 2: Cl ions should be properly written as chloride ions or Cl⁻</p> <p>Line 7: * this in turn in the expression of damage genotoxic* be rephrased as *this in turn is the expression of genotoxic damage *</p> <p>Paragraph 9, Line 3: In considering that the level, *that* should be removed,</p> <p>Line 4: B(a)P and that the EC50, *that* should be removed</p> <p>Line 7: These compounds to produce reactive derivatives *to* should be removed</p> <p>Paragraph 9 line 4 :Similar at the present study *at* should be replaced by *to*</p> <p>Line 9: Said derivative.should be written as *The derivative*</p> <p>5. CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>Paragraph 2, line 2: may be used as genotoxicity assays are rapid, *may be* should be removed</p> <p>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*</p>	
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.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Idorenyin Umoh
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Nigeria