



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_11260
Title of the Manuscript:	Petroleum Hydrocarbon-Induced Changes in Juice of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> following Chronic Exposure.
Type of the 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 <i>Areas highlighted in yellow should be effected and the line numbers where the corrections were made should be stated on this review form.</i>	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) The aim of the study should be clearly restated in the abstract. 2) Referencing The method of citation in the text is not in conformity with the SDI authors guidelines. The author(s) should peruse the SDI template and follow the format written therein. For example: Lines 40-42: Petroleum provides a relatively cheap and convenient source of 41 energy as compared to other fuels such as coal and electricity (Ake, 42 1979) [1]. Line 51: the soil as acid rain (Ikoro, 2003; Campbell, 2001) [2,3]. Lines 55-56: "diseases as well as damage to wild life and vegetations (Ikoro, 2003; 56 Dung <i>et al.</i>, 2008) [2,4]".	We believe that aim is usually stated at the end of the introduction. We have adopted the SDI author's guidelines format. We have adopted the SDI author's guidelines format.
Minor REVISION comments	3) The author should state how the results were expressed in the abstract. Mean± SD or Mean± SEM? 4) Glutathione, Citric acid and lactate dehydrogenase should be added to the existing	We have stated it in the paper. We have included them in the keywords.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	keywords. Line 84: "Ascorbic acid ~~is~~ was converted to dehydroascorbic..." 5) Did the author(s) conduct a dispersion concentration of air pollutants in the polluted area based on the basic point source Gaussian dispersion model? 6) What were the estimates of PM₁₀, SO₂ and NO_x emitted in the study areas? 7) Did the author(s) measure the pH of the soil from the two study areas? 8) How many trees were tested for each of the area? 9) How were the trees selected? By what criteria were they selected? Line 74: "The trees were of the same age bracket". 10) How did the author determine the ages of the trees? 11) How many fruits were collected per tree? Lines 79-80: The fruits were peeled and the juice squeezed through a funnel into a conical flask and then filtered before use. 12) According to whose method was the fruit	This has being changed to was. No. These parameters were not estimated in this study rather in another study on gas flaring and have been published. YES, But not in this study. Five from each environment. By random and distance distribution selection By questions from the owners. Ten fruits from each tree. We used manual juice press method.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	juice extracted? 13) I suggest the author(s) carry out a correlation analyses between glutathione, citric acid and LDH to further consolidate his/her argument. 14) Author(s) should look-up the proper expression of significance (p-values). Line 17-a: "...obtained revealed that there was no significant ($p \leq 0.05$ $P \geq 0.05$) difference..." 15) 17b: author should refrain from the use of "significant difference" as a term. Please, state whether there was an insignificant increase or decrease. Line 20: "Ebocha did not significantly ($p \leq 0.05$ $P \geq 0.05$) deviate from the value obtained". 16) Increase or decrease? Line 24: "significantly ($p \geq 0.05$ $P \leq 0.05$) lower than the values in the juice from Uvuru" Line 169: "radicals; thus, resulting in no significance ($p \leq 0.05$ $P \geq 0.05$)," Line 170-172: The mean concentration of glutathione in the juice from Ebocha was found to be significantly ($p \geq 0.05$ $P \leq 0.05$) lower than the value obtained for the juice from Uvuru (Figure 3).	We have corrected them according to reviewer's suggestions. We have modified it according the reviewers suggestions. We have corrected them according to reviewers suggestions We have corrected them according to reviewers suggestions.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 253: "This could explain why there was no significant ($p \leq 0.05$ $P \geq 0.05$) difference.." Line 309: The activity of LDH was significantly ($p \geq 0.05$ $P \leq 0.05$) increased Lines 301-309: should be taken to the discussion part of this manuscript or removed entirely. 17) According to the SDI template, the author(s) should insert the figures in the text to create cohesion of result and discussion, and enable readers understand perfectly the salient points.	We have adopted SDI template for References.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript contains some blemishes that can be amended.	