



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors describe the levels of ATPase activity in roots of beans and maize exposed to several fractions of crude oil. The manuscript is not acceptable at the present form since it contain many mistakes and lacks of exactness. For instance: It is not clear to me that the reference 11 mentioned any effect of exposure of plants to crude oil and heavy metal poisoning. It is not clear to me that reference 23 mentioned the ATPase activity with other substrates than ATP. It is not clear how they determine total ATPase activity. In the paper mentioned in Material and methods this activity is not determined. Neither the Na/K ATPase. The references 23 and 24 indicated in Results and discussion do not correspond to the indicated in the reference list.	In the cause of reading reference 11. We saw the statement though modified. We are not authors, hence the reference. Correction effected Correction effected The methods are established methods. Their description may be superfluous, however, corrections were effected Correction effected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors should pay attention to the spelling in the reference list as well as the accuracy of the manuscript, for instance in the reference 19: - The initial for Tajikuchi is missing - The publication year is incorrect (1982 instead of 1981) - effect of endomethacin instead of indomethsun - 713-717 instead of 713-713.	Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		