SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_22348**
Title of the Manuscript:	**THE MATHEMATICAL MODEL OF SELF-OSCILLATIONS OF KAI PROTEINS IN INCUBATION SOLUTION**
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	**1. According to Author's guidelines the Material and methods section has to be the next after Introduction. Authors also need to expand this section clarifying the main approaches you used in the study. For uninitiated reader it is mandatory to know from this section whether authors' model and presented constants were verified by direct experiment. If you have used only one approach (as it is noted in Materials and Methods) it could be useful to mention some examples of its successful usage for other analogous models.** **2. Conclusions section is needed. It has to underline the main results of the work and note if the results are corresponded to in vivo studies or other modelling of KaiC oscillation.** **3. Fig. 2. On Y-axis the concentration has to be supplied with units of measurement.**	
Minor REVISION comments	Language has to be checked. For example: activities [7,8] – [7, 8] consist from he rate – consists from the rate	
Optional/General comments	Unfortunately I am not so keen in mathematic modelling for making conclusions concerning author's calculations. However I think that the main results of them are: 1. Showed temperature-compensatory mechanisms of KaiC system regulation. 2. The proved oscillatory mechanism of phosphorylation-dephosphorylation cycle of KaiC. Am I right concluded that authors declare this oscillation as one of possible molecular clock that functions in the cells? I think it has to be underlined in the Conclusions, abstract and discussed in the Discussion sections. Maybe it could be good to divide Results and Discussion.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Volodymyr Chernyshenko**
Department, University & Country	**Protein Structure And Functions Department, Palladin Institute of Biochemistry, Ukraine**