SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_IJBcRR_7118**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Adenosine triphosphatase activities of Zea mays and Vigna unguiculata exposed to different crude oil fractions**
Type of the Article	**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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The methodology is extremely poor. It is necessary to explain how was realized enzyme's extraction, which was the buffer used and what were the buffer constituents. Need also determination of protein content. Why was only used mitochondria bean instead corn mitochondria too? Why fractionation was summarized to mitochondria? It would be also interesting dosage in tonoplast vesicles. How do you know which is the ATPase that is being measured? For each ATPase there is a method, one inhibitor, etc. You need to detail the methodology for each ATPase. There is much speculation surrounding the increased activity of ATPases. Perhaps be more appropriate to measure the content of any of these ions to really know if there was a change in both crops.	The methods are established methods. Their description may be superfluous, however, corrections were effected
Minor REVISION comments	The topic is relevant even though the article is very simple.	
Optional/General comments		