


e-ISSN : 2962-343X

# JBIOME

**JOURNAL OF BIO-MOLECULE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING**

**Volume 1, No. 1 (2022)**



Research Center for Bio-Molecule Engineering  
Universitas Airlangga

About Journal

Journal of Bio-Molecule Research and Engineering [JBIOME] (e-ISSN: 2962-343X) aims to encourage innovative researches and the publication in the fields of biomolecule engineering for supporting Sustainable Development Goals formulated in United Nation Resolution A/RES/70/1. Journal of Bio-Molecule Research and Engineering [JBIOME] (e-ISSN: 2962-343X) is a peer-reviewed, open-access journal that publishes original research articles, review articles, as well as short communication in the following areas: Biochemistry, Biotechnology, Bioengineering, Microbiology, Molecular Biology, Synthetic Biology, Natural Product Exploration and Extraction, Organic synthesis, Drug discovery, Bioinformatics, Interdisciplinary approaches to Biomolecule Engineering. Articles will be considered for publication on the condition that they have not been published or sent to other journals



Journal Description

Journal of Bio-Molecule Research and Engineering [JBIOME] (e-ISSN: 2962-343X) is a peer-reviewed, open-access journal that publishes original research articles, review articles, as well as short communication in the following areas: Biochemistry, Biotechnology, Bioengineering, Microbiology, Molecular Biology, Synthetic Biology, Natural Product Exploration and Extraction, Organic synthesis, Drug discovery, Bioinformatics, Interdisciplinary approaches to Biomolecule Engineering

Journal of Bio-Molecule Research and Engineering [JBIOME] (e-ISSN: 2962-343X) aims to encourage innovative researches and the publication in the fields of biomolecule engineering for supporting Sustainable Development Goals formulated in United Nation Resolution A/RES/70/1. JBIOME is a peer-reviewed, open access journal that publishes original research articles, review articles, as well as short communication in following areas: Biochemistry, Biotechnology, Bioengineering, Microbiology, Molecular Biology, Synthetic Biology, Natural Product Exploration and Extraction, Organic synthesis, Drug discovery, Bioinformatics, Interdisciplinary approaches to Biomolecule Engineering. Articles will be considered for publication on condition that they have not been published or sent to other journals.

Make Submission

- Aims and Scope
- Section Policies
- Peer Review Process
- Open Access Policy
- Article Processing Charge
- Plagiarism Screening
- Indexing
- Reviewer Team

Current Issue

Vol. 1 No. 1 (2022)



Published: July 29, 2022

Meet Our Editorial Team



Prof. Dr. Ni Nyoman Tri Puspangsih, M.Si
Chief Editor
Universitas Airlangga
Google Scholar
23006120200



Dr. Imam Siswanto
Associate Editor
Universitas Airlangga
Google Scholar
57203883917



Ali Rohman, Ph.D
Editorial Board Member
Universitas Airlangga
Google Scholar
23005953700
0000-0002-8177-5881

Read More

Download

Manuscript Template

## Articles

### In Silico Design Gene Encoding CYP71A1 for Expression in Escherichia coli

10.20473/biome.v1i1.35856

1 - 6

PDF

Evi Umayah Uifa

Read Statistic: 59

### Isolation and Characterization of Uricase Produced from Chicken Liver

10.20473/biome.v1i1.35859

7 - 13

PDF

Wuryanti Handayani, Nasrul Amalyatun Naja, Muhamad Kiki Afinda Joenata, Anak Agung Istri Ratnadewi

Read Statistic: 48

### Isolation and Enzymatic Degradation of Hemicellulose from Corncoobs Waste

10.20473/biome.v1i1.35855

14 - 21

PDF

Lailatul Fithri, Mamik Damayanti, Anna Kartika Ayu

Read Statistic: 56

### Partial Purification of Thermophilic Pectinase from Local Isolate Anoxybacillus flavithermus TP-01

10.20473/biome.v1i1.35861

22 - 31

PDF

Kartika Dwi Asni Putri, Galih Ahyusta Laras, Ismi Aulia Syafira, Afaf Bakfir

Read Statistic: 39

### Isolation and Characterization of Thermophilic Bacillus subtilis subsp. inaquosorum CGR-1 from Cangar Hot Springs

10.20473/biome.v1i1.35860

32 - 39

PDF

Almando Geraldi, Aulia Azzahra, Dimas Arya Ijlal Wafi, Febriani Sukma Maghfiroatul Chasanah, Lillah Asritefriha, Rizki Amaliah Zain, Us Watun Nurul Khasanah

Read Statistic: 71

[VIEW ALL ISSUES](#)

## Information

[For Readers](#)

[For Authors](#)

[For Librarians](#)

[View My Stats](#)



## Address

Kampus C, Jl. Unair, Mulyorejo, Surabaya  
City, East Java 60286

## Contact Info

biome@journal.unair.ac.id

Google Scholar citation was unvalidated product. [Click here to support us](#)

Type here to search

17:54  
07/12/2022



## Isolation and Characterization of Uricase Produced from Chicken Liver

Wuryanti Handayani, Nasrul Amaliyatun Naja, Muhamad Kiki Afindia Joenata,  
Anak Agung Istri Ratnadewi\*

Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematic and Natural Science, University of Jember, Jember 68121, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: istri\_dewi.fmipa@unej.ac.id

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Article history*

Received 09<sup>th</sup> Dec 2021

Accepted 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022

**Keywords:**

characterization

isolation

uricase

chicken liver

---

### ABSTRACT

Uricase is an enzyme that degrades uric acid into allantoin. One of the uricase sources is obtained from chicken species (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) liver which are broiler and native chicken. This study aims to determine the maximum uricase activity in broiler and native chicken liver. The uricase activity was obtained by measuring the uric acid concentration as uricase substrate using spectrophotometric method and wavelength at 291 nm. Uricase isolation was carried out into extraction process, ammonium sulfate fractionation (0-60% saturation of ammonium sulfate), and dialysis. During isolation process, centrifugation speed was also optimized to obtain the maximum uricase crude extract and uricase activity. The molecular weight of uricase was also determined by SDS PAGE. The result showed that the highest uricase activity remained using centrifugation speed of 15,000 rpm. The optimum uricase fraction for broiler chicken liver was obtained at 20-40% saturation of ammonium sulfate with uricase activity was  $1.854 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg, and the uricase fraction for native chicken liver was obtained at 40-60% saturation of ammonium sulfate with uricase activity was  $2.496 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. The optimum fraction for uricase production and isolation is carried out to the dialysis process. The optimum uricase activity of broiler chicken liver crude extract was  $4.921 \times 10^{-4}$  U/mg, the uricase fraction was  $3.989 \times 10^{-3}$  U/mg, and the dialysate was  $5.120 \times 10^{-3}$  U/mg. While the native chicken liver crude extract was  $2.980 \times 10^{-4}$  U/mg, the uricase fraction was  $1.415 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg, and the dialysate was  $1.753 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. The molecular weight of the uricase was around 35 kDa according to the SDS PAGE result.

© 2022 Published by University of CoE-Research Center for Bio-Molecule Engineering UNAIR

---

### 1. Introduction

Uric acid is the end product in purine metabolism [[1]]. Besides that, purine metabolism also can produce different end products. Some organisms have the ability to break down uric acid into nitrogen compounds that are simpler compound [[2]]. Humans are one of the organisms that do not have the ability to break down uric acid. It is because humans do not have uric acid-degrading enzyme activity called uricase. As a result, uric acid accumulates as stones in the joints and become some diseases such as rheumatism, gout, and hyperuricemia that can occur when uric acid levels exceed normal limits

[[3]]. Something that can be done is to obtain the uricase from other sources by isolating uricase so that it can be applied for the prevention of uric acid in the human body.

Several studies have carried out the isolation of the uricase in plants, microorganisms, and animals. Isolation of uricase from green bean leaves [[4]], *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* [[5]], *Streptomyces exfoliates* UR10 from agricultural waste [[6]], *Bacillus subtilis* strain SP6 [[7]], *Bacillus cereus* SKIII [[8]], *Aspergillus welwitschiae* strain 1-4 [[9]]. Isolation of the uricase from the liver of rainbow fish, mackerel, trout, catfish, shark and tilapia [[10]], Indonesian coelacanth [[11]], camel liver [[12]], and bovine kidney [[13]]. Based on previous studies, this study will isolate and characterize the uricase from chicken (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) liver which are broiler and native chicken liver. The different sources of chicken are due to the differences between the two types of chicken liver caused by the feed and physical activity of that chicken itself, thus are allowing for different enzyme-specific activity values and the long-term prospects are expected to be applied to the prevention of uric acid in the human body.

## 2. Materials and methods

Fresh chicken liver was taken from the chicken slaughterhouse at Jl. Danau Toba, Tegal Gede, Sumber Sari, Jember. Chicken liver was crushed and meshed using a blender and added sodium borate buffer (0.1 M, pH 10) in a ratio of 1:10 as the crude extract. The chicken liver crude extract was centrifuged at 13,000 rpm at 4 °C for 30 minutes. The pellet that was obtained was resuspended using the same solvent. The pellet and supernatant were centrifuged at 15,000 rpm at 4 °C for 30 minutes to obtain the combined supernatant.

The obtained supernatant was followed by parallel fractionation using ammonium sulfate (0–20%, 20–40%, and 40–60% saturation of ammonium sulfate). Solid  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$  is added slowly to the supernatant at 4 °C under gentle stirring. Then the mixture was centrifuged at 12,000 rpm for 30 minutes at 4 °C. The uricase activity and protein content of pellet and supernatant were determined. Then the ammonium sulfate residue in the optimum fraction was removed by dialysis overnight at 4 °C. The fraction was placed into cellophane bags and immersed in the same buffer. The buffer was changed every 3 hours so that the diffusion process could continue.

The uricase assay was done by adding 2 ml of borate buffer (0.1 M, pH 8.5) into 0.02 ml of uricase suspension and uric acid solution (3.57 mM, 0.01 mL), then incubated for 25 minutes at 37 °C. The enzyme reaction is stopped using the temperature of boiled water. The uricase activity can be determined from the amount of uric acid residue that is not degraded by uricase enzymatic reaction using UV-Vis spectrophotometer method at 291 nm wavelength. A unit of uricase activity is equal to 1  $\mu\text{mol}$  degraded uric acid per minute under certain temperature conditions.

The protein content was determined using the Bradford method with Bovine Serum Albumin as standard. The measurement was done by adding Bradford's reagent (1 mL) to the protein solution (0.1 mL) then being vortexed and allowed to stand for a while. After that, the absorbance was determined using a UV-Vis spectrophotometer at 595 nm. The protein content was obtained from absorbance conversion using standard curves [[14]]. The molecular weight of uricase was determined using SDS-PAGE.

### 3. Results and discussion

Uricase is an enzyme that can degrade uric acid into allantoin and  $H_2O_2$  for secondary products. Uricase isolation was done in several stages like extraction and purification using fractionation and dialysis. The determination of uricase molecular weight was also carried out by SDS-PAGE. The extraction stage was carried out using centrifugation speed 13,000 rpm and 15,000 rpm. The activity of the crude extract can be seen in **Table 1**.

Based on the extraction results, the highest uricase activity was obtained using centrifugation speed of 15,000 rpm. The uricase activity in pellets was not used for the purification process because the uricase activity in pellets was lower than in supernatants. The crude extract activity showed that the centrifugation speed affected the uricase specific activity values. A greater centrifugation speed causes many proteins other than the target protein to settle, so the other proteins are left in the supernatant in a small amount and do not really interfere with the uricase activity. The extract with the highest uricase activity was used in the fractionation optimization process. The uricase activity from the fractionation optimization process can be shown in **Table 2**.

The uricase activity in pellets was not used for the purification process because uricase activity in pellets was smaller than that of supernatants. The optimum fraction of both types of chicken liver lies in the supernatant. This is because the size of the other proteins is larger than the target protein, so when the ammonium sulfate is added, the protein with the larger size has been precipitated and leaves the target protein in the supernatant.

The (20–40%) fraction was determined as the optimum fraction in broiler chicken liver with uricase specific activity of  $1.854 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. This is consistent with the previous research which has been done, the isolation of the uricase enzyme from *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* using 25% saturation of ammonium sulfate [[15]]. Uricase was isolated from soybean root nodules using 35% saturation [[16]]. The fraction (40–60% saturation of ammonium sulfate) was determined as the optimum fraction in native chicken liver with uricase specific activity of  $2.496 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. This is in accordance with the previous study using 60% saturation of ammonium sulfate in isolation of uricase from *C. utilis* [[17]].

The optimum fraction was used for the production stage or the isolation stage using a larger volume with the same isolation technique. The uricase purity at the production stage is shown in **Table 3**. **Table 3** shows that the uricase purity from the extraction process to dialysate has been increasing. The increased uricase specific activity can be seen from the increase in purification fold. The uricase specific activity of broiler chicken liver extract was  $4.921 \times 10^{-4}$  U/mg and increased to  $3.989 \times 10^{-3}$  U/mg in the fractionation process. The dialysate also increased to  $5.120 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. The uricase specific activity of native chicken liver extract was  $2.980 \times 10^{-4}$  U/mg and increased during the fractionation process by  $1.415 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. The dialysate also increased to  $1.753 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg.

**Table 1.** Extraction result

Sample	Volume (ml)	Enzyme Activity (U/ml)	Total Activity (U)	Protein Content (mg/ml)	Total Protein (mg)	Enzyme Specific Activity (U/mg)
Extract A/ 13,000 rpm	8	$7.005 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.60 \times 10^{-2}$	30.325	3.791	$2.310 \times 10^{-4}$
Extract B/ 13,000 rpm	8	$3.914 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.13 \times 10^{-2}$	29.300	3.663	$1.336 \times 10^{-4}$
Extract A/ 15,000 rpm	6	$4.636 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.78 \times 10^{-2}$	0.290	0.048	$1.599 \times 10^{-2}$
Extract B/ 15,000 rpm	6	$4.430 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.66 \times 10^{-2}$	0.687	0.114	$6.452 \times 10^{-3}$

A: Broiler chicken liver; B: Native chicken liver

**Table 2.** Optimization of fractionation

Sample	Fraction	Volume (ml)	Enzyme Activity (U/ml)	Total Activity (U)	Protein Content (mg/ml)	Total Protein (mg)	Enzyme Specific Activity (U/mg)
Supernatant A	0-20	1.5	$1.349 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.024 \times 10^{-2}$	0.886	1.329	$1.524 \times 10^{-2}$
	20-40	1.3	$1.607 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.089 \times 10^{-2}$	0.867	1.127	$1.854 \times 10^{-2}$
	40-60	1.05	$5.872 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.166 \times 10^{-3}$	0.674	0.708	$8.717 \times 10^{-3}$
Supernatant B	0-20	1.5	$6.490 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.735 \times 10^{-3}$	1.214	1.821	$5.344 \times 10^{-3}$
	20-40	1.3	$8.550 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.112 \times 10^{-2}$	1.352	1.758	$6.326 \times 10^{-3}$
	40-60	1.05	$1.628 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.709 \times 10^{-2}$	0.652	0.685	$2.496 \times 10^{-2}$
Pellet A	0-20	1.5	$6.902 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.601 \times 10^{-3}$	1.207	1.811	$5.717 \times 10^{-3}$
	20-40	1.5	$4.430 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.953 \times 10^{-3}$	2.448	3.672	$1.810 \times 10^{-3}$
	40-60	1.5	$8.035 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.357 \times 10^{-3}$	0.991	1.487	$8.109 \times 10^{-3}$
Pellet B	0-20	1.5	$3.502 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.335 \times 10^{-3}$	1.337	2.006	$2.619 \times 10^{-3}$
	20-40	1.5	$1.751 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.167 \times 10^{-3}$	1.921	2.882	$9.115 \times 10^{-4}$
	40-60	1.5	$5.666 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.777 \times 10^{-3}$	1.063	1.595	$5.330 \times 10^{-3}$


A: Broiler chicken liver; B: Native chicken liver

**Table 3.** Production

Sample	Volume (ml)	Enzyme Activity (U/ml)	Total Activity (U)	Protein Content (mg/ml)	Total Protein (mg)	Enzyme Specific Activity (U/mg)	Purification (fold)
Extract A/15,000 rpm	32.3	$1.545 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.990 \times 10^{-2}$	3.140	101.416	$4.921 \times 10^{-4}$	1.00
Fraction A 40%	16.5	$5.872 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.689 \times 10^{-2}$	1.472	24.285	$3.989 \times 10^{-3}$	8.11
Dialysate A	5	$1.236 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.180 \times 10^{-3}$	0.242	1.208	$5.120 \times 10^{-3}$	10.40
Extract B/15,000 rpm	30	$9.271 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.781 \times 10^{-2}$	3.108	93.225	$2.980 \times 10^{-4}$	1.00
Fraction B 60%	16.1	$2.987 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.809 \times 10^{-2}$	0.211	3.400	$1.415 \times 10^{-2}$	47.48
Dialysate B	5	$3.090 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.545 \times 10^{-2}$	0.176	0.882	$1.753 \times 10^{-2}$	58.83

A: Broiler chicken liver; B: Native chicken liver

The results of uricase isolation using broiler chicken liver and native chicken liver have a smaller specific activity value compared to the previous study which used aves family (*Gallus gallus*) liver as an uricase source with the uricase specific activity of 0.030 U/mg [[18]]. This is due to differences in centrifugation techniques. Isolation of uricase using *Gallus gallus* as a sample was carried out by ultracentrifugation technique. The ultracentrifugation technique has more specific sample preparation in separating proteins based on the layer of the cells compared to ordinary centrifugation techniques, so that the protein from the uricase obtained is purer. The molecular weight of each isolation stage was determined using SDS-PAGE. The electrophoregram is shown in **Figure 1**. Based on the electrophoregram in **Figure 1**, the target protein is around 35 kDa. This is consistent with the previous study which reported that the molecular weight of the avian uricase was 35 kDa [[5]]. Another study also reported that the molecular weight of the uricase from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was 33 kDa [[19]] and uricase from bovine kidney was 70 kDa [[13]]. The molecular weight difference of uricases is due to the different species that they come from.



**Figure 1.** SDS-PAGE result (C: extract; F: fraction; D: dialysate; A: broiler chicken liver; B: native chicken liver)



#### 4. Conclusions

Centrifugation speed with maximum uricase activity was 15,000 rpm with a value of  $1.599 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg for broiler liver and  $6.452 \times 10^{-3}$  U/mg for native chicken liver. The optimum fraction for broiler chicken liver was in the fraction (20–40%) with a value of  $1.854 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg, while the native chicken liver was in the fraction (40–60%) with a value of  $2.496 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg. The dialysis process had a maximum uricase activity of  $5.120 \times 10^{-3}$  U/mg for broiler liver and  $1.753 \times 10^{-2}$  U/mg for native chicken liver. The uricase molecular weight was obtained for broiler and native chicken livers and was around 35 kDa. The uricase produced from broiler and native chicken liver can not be applied to the prevention of gout because it has a lower enzyme specific activity value than the uricase source from *Gallus gallus* liver which is 0.030 U/mg.

#### References

- [1] R. M. Kong, A. Yang, Q. Wang, Y. Wang, L. Ma, and F. Qu. Uricase Based Fluorometric Determination of Uric Acid Based on the Use of Graphene Quantum Dot@Silver Core-Shell Nanocomposites. *Microchimica Acta*. pp. 2–8, 2017.
- [2] E. Diantari and A. Candra. Pengaruh Asupan Purin dan Cairan terhadap Kadar Asam Urat Wanita Usia 50-60 Tahun di Kecamatan Gajah Mungkur, Semarang. *Journal of Nutrition College*. 2(1):44–49, 2013.
- [3] R. M. Hafez, T. M. Abdel-Rahman, and R. M. Naguib. Uric Acid in Plants and Microorganisms: Biological Applications and Genetics - a review. *Journal of Advanced Research*. 8:475–486, 2017.
- [4] P. Montalbini, M. Aguilar, and M. Pineda. Isolation and Characterization of Uricase from Bean Leaves and Its Comparison with Uredospore Enzymes. *Plant Science*. 147:139–147, 1999.
- [5] S. K. Abdullah and M. T. Flayyih. Production , Purification and Characterization of Uricase Produced by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Iraqi Journal of Science*. 56(3):2253–2263, 2015.
- [6] A. Magda, S. Tork, S. Al-Garni, and R. Allam. Production and Characterization of Uricase from *Streptomyces Exfoliatus* Ur10 Isolated from Farm Wastes. *Turkish Journal of Biology*. 37:520–529, 2013.
- [7] S. O. Pustake, P.K. Bhagwat, P.B. Dandge, Statistical media optimization for the production of clinical uricase from *Bacillus subtilis* strain SP6. *Heliyon* 5, 5, 2019.
- [8] S.E. Tork, M.M. Aly and S.Q. Al-Fattani, A new uricase from *Bacillus cereus* SKIII: Characterization, gene identification and genetic improvement. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, 2018.
- [9] N.E.A. El-Naggar, S.A. Haroun, E.M. El-Wesly, E.A. Metwally, A.A. Sherief, Mathematical modeling for bioprocess optimization of a protein drug, uricase, production by *Aspergillus welwitschiae* strain 1–4. *Sci. Rep.* 9 (1) 1-15, 2019.
- [10] J. E. Kinsella, B. German, and J. Shetty. Uricase from Fish Liver: Isolation and Some Properties. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology -- Part B: Biochemistry And*. 82B(4):621–624, 1985.
- [11] S. Yainoy, T. Phuadraksa, S. Wichit, M. Sompoppokakul, N. Songtawee, V. Prachayasittikul, C. Isarankura-Na-Ayudhya, Production and Characterization of Recombinant Wild Type Uricase from Indonesian *Coelacanth* (*L. menadoensis*) and Improvement of Its Thermostability by In Silico Rational Design and Disulphide Bridges Engineering. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 20 (6): 1269, 2019.
- [12] A. Osman, A. Del Corso, P. Ipata, and U. Mura. Liver Uricase in *Camelus dromedarius*: Purification and Properties. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 94B(3):469–474, 1989.
- [13] M. I. Rajoka, K. Ur-Rehman, M. Mehraj, M. W. Akhtar, and M. A. Zia. Purification, and Properties of a Bovine Uricase. *Protein and Peptide Letters*. 13:363–368, 2006.
- [14] M. M. Bradford. A Rapid and Sensitive Method for the Quantitation of Microgram Quantities of Protein Utilizing the Principle of Protein-Dye Binding. *Analytical Biochemistry*. 72: 248-254, 1976.

- [15] J. M. Alamillo and J. Cifirdenas. Purification and Molecular Properties of Urate Oxidase from *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*. 1076:203–208, 1991.
- [16] K. Lucas, J. B. Michael, and R. S Karel. Uricase from Soybean Root Nodules: Purification, Properties and Comparison with the Enzymes from Cowpea. *Archive of Biochemistry and Biophysics*. 226(1):190-197, 1983.
- [17] V. Adamek, B. Kralova, M. Schova., O. Valentova and K. Demnerova. Purification of Microbial Uricase. *Journal of Chromatography*.497:268-275, 1989.
- [18] P. J. Scott, L. P. Visentint and J. M. Allen. The Enzymatic Characteristics of Peroxisomes of Amphibian and Avian Liver and Kidney. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci*. 168:244-264, 1969.
- [19] A. Anderson and S. Vijayakumar. Purification and Optimization of Uricase Enzyme Produced by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Journal of Experimental Sciences*. 2(11):5–8, 2011.