



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>	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karen Cordovil
Department, University & Country	Brazil