



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_7336
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Chronic Exposure to Petroleum Hydrocarbon Pollution on Oxidative Stress Parameters and Histology of Liver Tissues of Native Fowl (Gallus domesticus)
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	The figures require reformatting: I would suggest to rescale figures, probably to bring several of them as several panel (f.e. current figures 2-4). The fonts also require rescaling to make them readable. It might be worth using guide for artwork used by some large publishing companies (Elsevier, Blackam etc...) I would also suggest for Fgs 5-6 to make additional panels with higher magnification and resolution (if the authors still have such images/sections).	Figures modified according to reviewer's suggestions. We could not provide higher resolution because the sections are not available.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Figures 1-4 present data from in vivo studies. Usually these parameters have quite broad range of values. Therefore, it may be better to change the style from simple charts to either box- and whisker graph or to plots with individual values on it (like in http://dmd.aspetjournals.org/content/36/9/1786.full). However, this is not strictly required. - The manuscript has a few technical errors and mistypes. For example, reference 18: year 2003b! Or Referense 17: bold letter inside a Journal's title... Therefore, the authors are advised to carefully revise the manuscript	The style has been changed. References 17 and 18 have been corrected according to reviewer's suggestions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This concise but very interesting study is presented in a very good English and is nicely written. The authors' concept is original, and is backed up by the experimental data. Noteworthy, the study is based on several standard approaches used in the field of oxidative stress. The manuscript is definitely suitable for publishing. However, there are three requests for improvements which do not require any additional experiments but might improve data presentation (see above).	