



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_9006
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioaccumulation and evidence of hormonal disruptions in tilapia fish (<i>Oreochromis spp.</i>) exposed to sub-lethal concentrations of pesticides in Sinaloa, Mexico
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	I cannot tell from the methods the experimental design of this study. Was it 3 females and 3 males per aquarium, or just 3 females, or 3 cohorts? How many aquaria were used? Were the statistics run using fish as the experimental unit or the aquaria? If the fish were used, then this could be a fatal flaw because if the treatments were applied to different aquaria, then the aquaria are the experimental unit. It is impossible to evaluate the results from this paper without a clear understanding of the methods.	We agree with the reviewer comment. The number of tilapia (male or female) per aquarium, were 3, and all experiments were performed by triplicate. This comment also was indicate by other reviewer; therefore the redaction was changed as follow: ...the female tilapia was separated from the male and distributed randomly in glass aquaria (50Lx30Wx40H cm.) each, at a rate 3 fish/aquarium containing 30 L of aerated water. The female aquaria were divided into five groups with three replicates each per group. The first group was free any pesticides and maintained as a control female group. The second, third, fourth and fifth groups were exposed to 2.8, 15.0, 225.0 and 315.0 µg/l of endosulfan, lindane, diazinon, and malathion, respectively for 21. While the male aquarium were divide into three groups with three replicates each per group. (Lines 68 to 75)
Minor REVISION comments	Can't tell what the error bars in the figures signify – SD, SE???	The error bars, correspond to Standard; Deviation (SD); such as the text say in Line 110. All experiments were performed by triplicate and a SYSTAT software (Version 11, SPSS) was used to calculate the means and standard deviations of each experiment data,.....
	English grammar needs a little work	English grammar needs a little work. We agree with the reviewer comment. The grammar and redaction were improved at all text



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	lines 56 and 57 show bias in the study. If the researchers undertook this study to “reinforce regulation and policies...”, it says to me that they are not necessarily approaching this with an open mind and are likely to interpret the results in the way that reinforces regulation. What would they have done if the results showed less regulation was required?	We agree with the reviewer comment; i.e, the approach this study, is to know if the pesticides assayed, induce endocrine alterations in tilapia. However, in order to attend the reviewer comment, we re-wrote the paragraph as follow: Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate the potential impacts of pesticides currently used in Sinaloa, Mexico as (EDs) on tilapia, and as a complementary part , with the view to reinforce regulation and policies in the management of these pesticides.
---	--	---