



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_49940
Title of the Manuscript:	Eukaryotic Multi-subunit DNA dependent RNA Polymerases: an Insight into their Active Sites and Catalytic Mechanism
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Dear authors Congratulations on the Study. Below I make some considerations for the article to improve even more.</p> <p>Abstract - in methods explain better the methods used because it was not clear. The methodology is the same thing. place a session only. Results - is too long. the most important results for the study.</p> <p>2) Introduction - place the tables according to the standardization of the journal. - Remove further introduction. - Bring more objectivity to the central theme of the article. -Improve the justification for the study "I did not quite understand what the purpose of the job was. Review the last paragraph of the introduction.</p> <p>Methodology - is poor and without foundation.</p> <p>In general, the study needs to improve. There is little objectivity of what the authors intended to do if it exists, it is not clearly stated. Authors need to improve writing. need to better describe what kind of study they are proposing to do considering the types of studies in the traditional scientific methodology.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. I am submitting the following points for your kind perusal</p> <p>Abstract: The method described are well-known method for protein sequence analysis. The supportive data and their methods are described in the relevant papers cited in the Reference section.</p> <p>Results: The results are analyzed in three parts, viz. Rpb2 initiation subunits analysis and its important findings, Rpb1 elongation subunits analysis and its important findings, Mix and Match analysis of Rpb2 and Rpb1 with their prokaryotic counterparts. As hundreds of protein sequences and their corresponding experimental data are analyzed in such studies obviously the article becomes lengthy as compared to an experimental paper.</p> <p>Introduction: All the tables are changed to the journal format and also the Reference section. It is written as a Research and Review type of article with a little elaborate introduction. Purpose of the study is given in the "Aim" itself Last paragraph of the introduction was clumsy and it was rewritten as suggested.</p> <p>Methodology: The main methodology, ClustalW programme is the gold standard, for such analysis. To further the study, possible steps in the polymerization reactions are included in the text now, which was not included in the earlier version. The objectivity of the analysis is mentioned in the abstract itself. Possible errors (typos and grammatical errors) in the manuscript were checked by online software. All the information regarding the structure and function of a protein is contained in the protein sequence itself. This study not only corroborates the experimental results but also pave way for more experiments on the predictions to understand the enzymes' active sites better for protein engineering and drug developments.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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