



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_22984
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of additive (s) and temperature on the velocity of hydrolysis of raw starch with human salivary α - amylase.
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	See my comments are in the yellow boxes in the text about the quality of the Figures. <u>Lines 198, 244, 384, 450, 466, and 474</u> The quality of Figs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 must be improved.	All figures were improved upon using computer tool/aid; But for cost, coloured data points on graph are sharper than gray colour.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	My comments are in the yellow boxes in the text. <u>Line 2</u> I suggest to use ... additives <u>Line 13 – 14</u> to rewrite this sentence <u>Line 17</u> I suggest to change ...significance... to ...importance... <u>Line 34</u> to add a reference <u>Line 36</u> delete 5 <u>Lines 40, 41, and 43</u> I suggest to use (i) instead (1) I suggest to use (ii) instead (2) I suggest to use (iii) instead (3) <u>Line 50</u> to define the country <u>Line 58</u> to add reference <u>Line 70</u> to use wavelength <u>Line 81</u>	Also, <i>the decrement in activity (expressed as percentage of control)</i> due to the presence of ethanol only as shown below Figure 2 does not agree with the observation that alpha amylase in the saliva and plasma of habitual alcohol drinkers is significantly higher than in non – drinking controls [6]. A reinterpretation <i>Decrease in activity of the enzyme which was expressed as percentage of control activity and plotted versus molar concentration of the salt (Figs.1 and 2), does not agree with observation elsewhere [36]. Also, the decrement in activity (expressed as percentage of control) due to the presence of ethanol only as shown below Figure 2 does not agree with the observation that alpha amylase in the saliva and plasma of habitual alcohol drinkers is significantly higher than in non – drinking controls [6]. A reinterpretation</i> The effect of increasing salt concentration on the activation parameters for the hydrolysis of starch with HSαA is shown in Figs 4 and 5.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to define the centrifuge (clinical centrifuge???) or to use ..xg <u>Line 87, 90, 93</u> <u>Line 94</u> to correct <u>Line 97 – 99</u> <u>Line 102</u> to correct <u>Line 106</u> to change to elsewhere <u>Line 185</u> to correct <u>Line 190</u> <u>Line 261-264</u> <u>Line 441</u> to rewrite <u>Line 446</u> to verify <u>Line 459</u> to correct <u>Line 532</u> The conclusion must be shortened <u>Line 551</u> Suggestions of some references to be included in Introduction/Discussion about the importance of the Salivary Alpha-Amylase. <u>Line 648</u> Repetitions of Figures and Tables. To verify	The <i>loss of activity (expressed as percentage of control)</i> at 310.15K, <i>decreased</i> with increasing concentration of the salt (negative correlation or negative slope), as observed elsewhere [29]. This is empirically observed with the option to use data directly or figures obtained by plotting decrement or increment expressed as percentage of control (an arithmetic operation) as the case may be versus molar concentration of salt. <i>Although $\Delta G^\#$ values in the presence of the salt were higher than values in calcium chloride free reaction mixture</i>, the values in the presence of the salt were not strongly concentration dependent ($R^2 = 0.541$): A Reinterpretation <i>Conclusion was shortened</i> <i>The new references were included [4-6, 7, 17-18]; [17 and [18] were included to justify claim or speculation that was object of investigation.</i> Repetition was so carried out on the assumption that figures and table should be submitted in separate pages: these are as such delete
Optional/General comments		