



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_31097
Title of the Manuscript:	Temperature induced conformational entropy of α -amylase with and without additive.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I accept authors response on my comment no (1). However I cannot understand the objective and the meaning of a response like that “I doubt if a student can be sincere and serious if he/she says that that she/he is unable to carry an assignment to calculate the average values of a parameter including the associated SEM or SD because of the absence of internet network despite the available laptop”. Moreover, authors' main response on my comments (2) & (3), i.e. from “...Duplicate assays were carried out: Plots of velocities or activities...” up to “.... Issues regarding kinetic parameters are outside the scope of the research”, it seems to me as completely unscientific showing ignorance of the basics, in order to design, perform and publish original scientific work; to be more precise, (a) parametric statistics as those used by the authors, need a huge population of the used sample(s) of measurements etc, from the experimenter in order to have also normal distribution of the experimental errors and homogeneity of the variance or else, only non parametric statistics could give reasonable results and they should be used, i.e. EXCEL cannot perform such statistics, as well as duplicates do not guaranteed the aforementioned requirements, (b) authors should know that the reciprocal of any experimental response is strongly erroneous (it has been published long ago, e.g. “Statistical Estimations in Enzyme Kinetics”, by G. N. WILKINSON, 1960) and thus could not be used after 57 years(!), and yes we need suitable non linear model equations whose fitting, nowadays, is very easy, (c) authors, also, should know the natural meaning of the parameters like k_{cat}/K_m, k_{cat} etc, as well as how these parameters should estimated and utilized not only for enzyme kinetics purposes, and therefore to understand (the authors) that “Enzyme activity” is meaningful only when it is associated to any one of the Michaelis-Menten parameters, i.e. is located on either the early initial steps of the enzymatic reaction or on about the saturation of enzyme by the substrate (i.e. on a quasi linear part) or else cannot be estimated, or it is estimated with huge errors (for reasons which should need pages to be explained, although they are published by respectful researchers who are experts in those scientific field). Overall: This manuscript entitled as “Temperature induced conformational entropy of α-amylase with and without additive” should either undergo a major revision, or to be rejected, as based on the responses of authors to the comments of the reviewer	

Reviewer Details:

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