SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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 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	**According to the comments mentioned just above** The manuscript entitled as "**Calcium ion binding characteristics of porcine pancreatic alpha amylase outside active site domain and implications: Theory and experimentation**" is an interesting one by based on its conception; however the experimentation which has been applied by the author(s) did not meet the generally approved standards in the field of enzyme kinetics. In more details: {a} author(s) have performed their analyses under conditions where the well known Michaelis-Menten equation is not valid, i.e. the prerequisite of [E]t<<[S]t is not fulfilled in this work; {b} as a consequence of the previous {a}, all the estimated rate constants seems more likely that are not valid; {c} potentially, the previously mentioned errors to have been incorporated in the calculations; {d} author(s) do not mention, in the text, the value of the Arrhenius pre-exponential factor in their particular cases; {e} in all cases of linear fittings, which are depicted in the figures 1,3-6, the estimated R2 is very far apart from a unit-value, indicating either a poor fitting and/or considerably few data points; {f} in figure 2, author(s) try to extract information by using quite a few number of data points, in contrast to the well known experimentation in similar cases; {g} in chapter 3.4.2., there is nothing more than a title, and thus I cannot guess both the used statistics, as well as their appropriate use and robustness; {h} authors should ameliorate the syntax of their text and to try to	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	express more precisely their results and conclusions.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Emmanuel M. Papamichael***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Chemistry, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, Greece***