

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_119313
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Genotoxicity by Comet Assay in Tissues of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> Exposed to Cassava Effluent
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, however the work is not innovative</p> <p>The title is adequate</p> <p>The Abstract like all the manuscript, arrive to obvious conclusions, like the authors declared: <i>The investigation also showed that DNA damage increased with increasing concentration, indicating a dose-dependent genotoxic effect of cassava wastewater on post-juveniles of C. gariepinus.</i></p> <p>The work is scientifically important, however, Several Research in Aquatic Toxicology demonstrated that the toxic effects of cyanide in <i>Clarias spp.</i>, were hypoxia and subsequently death in the first 25 minutes; since cyanide reversibly binds to the ferric ions in cytochrome oxidase within the mitochondria. Also, the behavior of fish in the face of cyanide toxicity is very similar to contamination by cassava wastewater: therefore, these conclusions are not relevant. On the other hand, the authors show photos or images where do not clearly demonstrate the DNA damage Vs wastewater concentrations; also the authors show the olive moment in damaged DNA; how they calculated these values; moreover, there are no average values and standard deviation (Fig. 2)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The authors have several grammatical errors and say that the DNA electrophoresis conditions were 300 amps and 25 V; 300 amps is too high; DNA electrophoresis is normally performed at 250-300 mA; that is, a thousand times lower than they used.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest that Authors conduct a thorough review of their work.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. Guillermo Galindo Reyes
Department, University & Country	Technological University of Esquinapa, Mexico