



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16369
Title of the Manuscript:	Chromosomal abnormalities among petrol station workers occupationally exposed to Benzene
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In summary, you must delete the word our. It is important to use third party; Wrong place also on target to investigative Also, this should be corrected as it is assumed to be an investigation. Line 65, need not include: Thus, after numerous attempts we obtained permission. Line 74, After etc... just place a point Line 167, remove the + Line 178 changing our study by the study (using third person).	Thank you for your valuable comments. All corrections you requested were done, review please, but sorry I couldn't understand this part It is important to use third party; Wrong place also on target to investigative Also, this should be corrected as it is assumed to be an investigation. Please clarify so I could do it
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I congratulate the authors, is a very interesting research work.	