



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_16387
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO AND IN VIVO EFFECT OF QUERCETIN ON HEPATOCYTE TRANSMEMBRANE N^+, K^+- ATPase ACTIVITY IN RATS
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Last paragraph under Introduction (linea 62-70) needs revision and elaboration to put forward the point that some antioxidants such as genistein inhibited and activated the same ATPase in the same tissue under different conditions, hence this study was meant..... 2. Number of animals in all groups and controls need to be given, also in figure legends number of experiments from which the SD was calculated need to be given. 3. In lines 144-157, the authors jumped to talk about genistein without excuse or introduction, to reach an explanation for the inhibitory effect of quercetin. It is better to start talking about the possible mechanism of action of quercetin, then mentioning the proposed redox nature by others for the ATPase, upon which they explained the opposite effects of genistein on normal and diseased cases. So these lines need to be revised carefully by elaborating further on the redox mechanism (see ref 25 for this).	1. Thank you for your various comments. Our primary focus in this work was quercetin, thus, our review was majorly on quercetin. We introduced genistein in the review because it has antioxidant effect like quercetin and was shown to have both inhibitory and enhancing effect on Na⁺, K⁺- ATPase. So we think the last paragraph will suffice as background considering the scope of our study. 2. This has been effected. 3. Since the scope of our study did not include mechanistic study (mechanism of action) of quercetin, in order to discuss the possible mechanism of action, we have used genistein, an antioxidant like quercetin, which has been shown to also have inhibitory effect on Na⁺, K⁺-ATPase. Since writing discussion does not allow for detail literature review, a mentioning was made and reference was given for further reading.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This MS needs minor revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		