



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	<p>The text does not contain the abbreviations PHEN, ANT, and so on. Perhaps this means: Anthracene, Phenanthrene and Benzo (a) pyrene solutions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Incorrect statistical analysis of the results, since there is no calculation of the significance of differences and a description of the method. Only Mean \pm Standard Deviation (SD) values are given, which is not enough for reliable scientific results and conclusions, and therefore the conclusions look untenable.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Litvinova Larisa Sergeevna</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia</i>