



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_26332
Title of the Manuscript:	Calcium ion binding characteristics of porcine pancreatic alpha amylase outside active site domain and implications: Theory and experimentation.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>An important point, which is still annoying me, is the statistical analysis of the results; authors, in the revised form of their manuscript refer that they used both the Microsoft Excel, and some hand calculator, although proper statistical packets are very common and they are provided free from internet, at least for academics. Finally, it seems more likely that authors are more expert in design and performing calculations than in the experimentation, and they should be more careful in their future work on that.</p>	<p>Thank you for your concern on the need to be conversant with software for statistics.</p> <p>Please, understand that when large data set is involved it may be easier and faster with statistical software; but taking average less than 6 different quantities of the same parameter using internet based soft ware could be more time consuming; besides statistical software are engineered based on statistical formulas. Microsoft Excel can be used to carry statistical analysis; average of 4+6+7+8+9 can be easily calculated using electronic calculators that hardly face challenges of power outage. <i>The subtitles which define the parameters were mysteriously omitted but have now been typed in Table 1; the data are experimental values. A lot of tests were carried out.</i> I doubt if it will not amount to repetition if average values, STDEV, SEM, SD, <i>t</i>-test etc are determined based on statistical formula and statistical packets/Excel using small data set ≤ 10. With respect to Evaluators concern, carefulness is indeed, very important.</p>