



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13509
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of L-Buthionine Sulfoximine on the Cytotoxicity and Interaction of As, Cd, Hg, and Pb on MCF 7 Cell Line
Type of the Article	Short 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To reviewer's understanding, this study was to study the toxicities of 4 metals, with LBSO only a regulator for GSH. Thus the content in this study is far from its title. Please revise the title to fit the objective of this study.</li> <li>2. GSH is the consequence of toxicant treatment. It is hard to convince reviewer that metals induce cytotoxicities via the induction of GSH. Please provide further evidences to prove this point, e.g., pretreating cells with GSH to see if GSH could change the induced-toxicities.</li> <li>3. Will the authors be able to provide reasonable explanation why the Pb treatment cause GSH level decreasing while other 3 increase GSH level.</li> <li>4. No solvent controls were used for comparison. Since 4 metals was dissolved with different solvents. Thus solvent control is necessary for each metal</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have reviewed the title of the manuscript</li> <li>2. The question 2 was not within the scope of this study. This area could be addressed when further studies are conducted in this area.</li> <li>3 It is unknown why Pb treatment did not induce the increased production of cellular GSH.</li> <li>4</li> </ol>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 118, "... was used to seed..." should be "... was used to feed..."</li> <li>2. Line 121, "...GSH..." should be "...GSH level..."</li> <li>3. Line 338, "...GHS..." should be "...GSH..."</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In cell culture, cell is seeded not feed.</li> <li>2. Corrections were made to address your questions 2 and 3.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<b>Authors should have their manuscript reviewed by professionals for grammar, style, structure and punctuation before submitting a revision.</b>	The whole paper was reviewed and the grammar constructions and punctuations were reviewed.