



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_8079
Title of the Manuscript:	QUANTAL RESPONSE OF PERIWINKLE (TYMPANOTONUS FUSCATUS) AFTER EXPOSURE TO KEROSENE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author seems to have carried out the experiment. But probably no standard test protocol was followed. This led to many irrelevant data without which the objective of the research will still be fulfilled. ABSTRACT Line 15.... Include mg/l after 200 Line 17... mg/l should be outside the bracket after 94.20. Line 19 Correct con to can and include 'a' before spill. Ques to be clarified.....i) What test protocol was used for the acute toxicity test? ii) Any physicochemical parameters tested and what methods were used? INTRODUCTION	What do you mean by standard test protocol. I followed the required test standard in this experiment. I have published other articles in similar areas. I know what is involved in acute toxicity test. Table 1. deals with the total mortality in all the replicates. That is the mortalities in a treatment were added together. Table 2. Is the mean, where the Anova was applied and the subsequent separation by the DMRT. ABSTRACT The corrections has been effected. The physico-chemical parameters did not show any significant difference and so may not have contributed to the mortalities and therefore I did not find it reasonable to add it. INTRODUCTION Line 25, the ref. At the end covers that statement as well. The other suggestions has been taken care of.

	The mechanism petroleum products toxicity is stated in the discussion.
Line 25... include a reference at the end of the sentence.	
Line 27...include.. ‘due to the increased occurrence of these pollutants.’ Delete from ‘to to occurrence’	
Line 29..... put a comma after <i>et al.,</i>	
Line 31.... Replace....‘and are’ with ‘which have been’	
Include a paragraph on the mechanism of action of petroleum products especially kerosene on benthic organisms.	
Line 54..... replace‘toxicity’ with ‘acute toxicity’.	
MATERIALS AND METHODS	
Line 65..... include ‘base used for the test’ after substrate.	
Line 66.... State the test protocol used for the test with reference.	
Line 68..... Put a space between about and 250g..... Replace were with was....	
Line 73... replace toxicant media with test media	
	MATERIALS AND METHODS What do you mean by test protocol. I have effected the required corrections. It is a static renewal bioassay. The volume of the test solution has been included. The 15 minutes is more appropriate considering the behaviour of the test organism which I worked with.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 75..... replace 15 minutes with 5 minutes Line 77..... include the volume of test solution used. State if static or semistatic method was used. RESULTS Line 88..... Delete lines 88, 89, 90 and 91. Start the results from line 92. Most test protocols express results as mean mortality (LC₅₀) and the total is usually inferred. I think table 1 should go and table2 should be table 1. Line 94.....include ' and time' after concentration Line 96.....replace 'were' with 'was' and delete LC₉₀,LC₉₅ and LC₉₉.I don't see their relevance and all were not included in the discussion. Line 97.....delete respectively and why was 24 hours not included. State if it could not be determined. Line 99..... include 'and time' before increased. Line 100- 101..... Delete values for LC₉₉. Tabulate values for LC₅₀and theprobit equations as Table 2. Line 104.....Delete MLTs 90, 95 and 99. Report results	RESULTS All the tables are relevant and each has the role it is playing in discussing the work. Every experimenter has a way of presenting his results depending on what is aiming at. There is no Standard method of presenting results. If every person should be stereo typed to one method then tell me why is research necessary. Toxicity is majorly presented in the form of LC₅₀ but are also expressed in other lethal concentrations. To enable effective legislation and awareness in the society of the implications associated with toxicologists excess concentrations of contaminants or pollutants. For me all the tables are equally relevant. It ios not only toxicologists and environmentalists that will come across the work. It is for the general audience. The standard deviations takes care of the standard error required.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of MLT_{50} only as for the LCs. Line 111-114....delete table 1 Line 116.....' A' in after should be lower case. Include for 96 hours after exposure. Line 119..... Change Table 3 to 2. Include 'for' before the 96 hours. Delete LC 90, 95 and 99 from the table. Include the standard errors since test were done in replicates	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Revision comments if can be effected will make the paper publishable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		