



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_26332</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Calcium ion binding characteristics of porcine pancreatic alpha amylase outside active site domain and implications: Theory and experimentation.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The study is just correct, not revelatory</p> <p>Introduction: proper and suitable, well written;</p> <p>Methodology: typical, but appropriate;</p> <p>Results: relatively limited experimental data are available; the disadvantage of this report is lack of verification of the experimental results precision and accuracy – validation of the results and methodology must be performed and results quality should be proved; information: how many experiments were performed in replicates should be included? please provide the number of experiments;</p> <p>a separate statistical methods section is needed. Also the analysis of statistical significance of the results should be investigated;</p> <p>several additional information should be complemented: what is the degree of purity of the chemicals used in study? were the blank samples prepared along with all the other samples and used for correction of measured signals?</p> <p>Discussion: accurate;</p> <p>Bibliography/References: in most cases - up to date, but it should be rearranged and corrected.</p>	<p>I guess the reviewer implies “improved” rather than proved. Statistical information was carelessly omitted during copying and pasting in manuscript template. This information is hereby included; assays were carried out in duplicates at different temperatures in the presence of different concentration of the salt to give a total of about 48 assays. Graphical plots were carried out in duplicates.</p> <p>Blanks – with substrate only and with enzyme only were prepared and used for correction. The references with error were corrected to reflect journal's format.</p> <p>Test of significant difference in activity between control and test at two salt concentrations (1mM and 5 mM) are included where possible.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	several editorial mistakes must be corrected, as well as grammar or language errors	Mistakes and grammar were revisited but perfection may not be the case.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		