



SDI Review Form 1.6

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Mon, May 6, 2013 at 2:19 AM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Polite reminder regarding submission of your valuable final decision for manuscript number 2013 IJBcRR 3777

Greetings to you. Find the attached comments (in blue text) as my final reviewer feedback and recommendation for manuscript number 2013 IJBcRR 3777.
Thanks for allowing me to participate along with other Reviewers - to review this manuscript.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Edward Eteshola

Davis Heart & Lung Research Inst

Columbus, OH , USA

Note: Modification was done in this email ONLY to hide the identity.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Attach File:

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_3777
Title of the Manuscript:	DNA polymerases: An insight into their active sites and catalytic mechanism

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment Although, the author commented in his response that he addressed the concerns raised by one of the previous Reviewers (Prof. Ali Osman Belduz), I notice that the minor corrections suggested by the other previous Reviewer of the manuscript (Dr. Sherry A. Dunbar) for lines 1726-1729 have not been made in either the Word or PDF versions of the manuscript. I suggest that these minor corrections be made, and thereafter, the manuscript can be accepted for publication.	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The suggested minor corrections have been made by the author; I suggest the manuscript be accepted for publication.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		The grammatical errors around lines 1726-1729 are corrected and highlighted in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article was very well written and the content is scientifically sound, and will be of great interest to a readership of biochemists, enzymologists and biophysical chemists.	