



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_31745
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of chronic occupational exposure to petroleum products on Haematological and biochemical parameters
Type of the Article	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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of chronic occupational exposure to petroleum products on Hematological indices and liver biochemical profile among gasoline station attendants in Enugu, Nigeria.</p> <p>However, the entire work requires a major modification including language modification.</p> <p>Title: Appears incomplete, please modify to reflect contents.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p><u>Aim:</u> Please restructure the aim.</p> <p>All subsections of the manuscript should be numbered e.g.,</p> <p>1.0 Introduction</p> <p>2. Materials and Methods</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>3. Results</p> <p>4. Discussion</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Please summarize the introduction and provide information on relevant studies and explain other authors findings if any.</p> <p>The aim of the study should not be given a separate subheading. It should be made to constitute a part of the concluding section of the introduction.</p> <p>Material and Methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please describe the instrument of survey properly e.g., type, source, validity and reliability. 2. Describe the exposure assessment to support causality, without which the whole result is speculative. 3. The lead level in the petroleum product samples should be included and correlation with blood lead level otherwise causality is not established. 4. There is need to include the socio-demographic characteristics of the studied participants as these may affect results. 5. Include a brief description of how the trace element levels were determined. 6. What informed the use of 2years as a dividing line? 7. The authors should explain the choice of AST and AL to asses liver biochemical activities while excluding other important parameters such as alkaline phosphatase (ALP) and bilirubin and protein. 8. Inclusion of at least one oxidative stress marker would have strengthened 	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>results.</p> <p>9. Air quality assessment within and outside some petroleum stations if performed could have added more strength to the results.</p> <p>10. Discussion doesn't reflect results obtained.</p> <p>11. The author should focus on the results of the present study, while comparing the results with previous studies.</p> <p>12. Has the results answered study hypothesis?</p> <p>Statistical Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indicate the level of significant at which the tests are considered significant. ▪ Penultimate line "year of duration of occupational exposure", please check. <p>Table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Inconsistencies in table numbering in the result section and on top of the table. The table number should be in Arabic numerals i.e., 1, 2, 3 etc. ❖ *P<0.05 should be written instead of P=0.05. This correction should also be effected in the statistical analysis. <p>Note: Results are presented as mean and standard deviation but not mean ± standard deviation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Please elaborate a little more on the results. The variable in the table are not well explained in the result section. ❖ The use of graph would be preferable for better presentation of data. ❖ What of other possible risk factors how were they controlled for? <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No evidence of oxidative imbalance shown in the results. ▪ The entire manuscript requires language editing. 	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Reference: Please format according to the journal specification.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Christopher Edet Ekpenyong</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Physiology, University of Uyo, Nigeria</i>