



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_6363
Title of the Manuscript:	History and Biology of Transglutaminase 2: A Synopsis
Type of the Article	Review

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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	This review is a very clear compendium of the state of the art of the research in mammalian (human) TG. It is easily readable and surely will be useful also for not specialists. Nevertheless a few observations should be considered. Some recent reviews were not mentioned, but the fundamental ones are. The figures are not original drawing of the authors but are reproduced from previous reviews to which more credit should be given by mentioning that these are reviews. Some figures have a large legend, whereas others are difficult to be completely understood, like 1.6. It should be, also briefly, mentioned in introduction that other forms of TG also exist in other animals, plants and microorganisms. Thus the family of TG is widespread in all the living organisms, and this increases its importance. May be it is an impression, but possibly, the fundamental work of Jack E. Folk is a little underestimated in the introduction § 2. of the paper and also in relationship with his work related to polyamines as substrates of the enzyme.	I agree with the reviewer's comments and appropriate corrections have been effected accordingly (as highlighted in the revised version).



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It seems more appropriate to write the name of the authors instead of the number of the reference as subject of a sentence trough out the entire text. I.e.: “In 1966, [15] observed that the ‘blood coagulation factor XIII’ was an isoenzyme...” Why the number 1 in fig 1.1, 1.2 etc and not simply fig. 1, fig. 2 ? Line 62-3 “However, a catalytically inactive erythrocyte membrane protein band 4.2 was also discovered to belong to the TG family. 63 Though, it has over 30% similarity with certain TG isoenzymes....” Just for information: it has been recently reported (Beninati et al. Amino Acids. 2013) that a plant TG has a practically identical amino acid composition (0,3% difference) but this is an active cross-linking enzyme. In literature list is it correct to put “et al.” instead of all the names of authors? Some references were abbreviated and others cited all the authors. This second way clarifies the composition of the group and evidences also the leader of the lab, which, frequently, is reported as last name as well as the contribution of all the authors. Fig. 1.6 arrived in non-correct graphical conditions, please check (beta 1 , alfa 5) and nucleus.	Necessary changes have been made in accordance to the reviewer’s suggestions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		