

$$\frac{1}{v} = \frac{1}{k_{cat}[E]_0} \left(1 + \frac{K_N \left(1 + \frac{1}{K_{eq,1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} [D_i]} \right)}{[N]} \right), \quad (6)$$

the slope of the double reciprocal plot is $\frac{K_N}{k_{cat}[E]_0} \left(1 + \frac{1}{K_{eq,1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} [D_i]} \right)$ and the intercept is

$\frac{1}{k_{cat}[E]_0}$. In the current work, K_{eq} from Datta and Licata [ref] was used in this expression. The effect of uncertainties in K_{eq} on the resulting estimate of K_N were mitigated through the use of a large excess of $[SP]=[D_0]$.

k_{cat} and $K_{eq,1}$ can be determined given an estimate of K_N by plotting $1/v$ against $1/[S_1] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} [D_i] \approx [SP]_0$ at constant $[N]$. We find that according to the relationship

Comment [RC9]: This can be omitted

$$\frac{1}{v} = \frac{1}{k_{cat}[E]_0} \left(1 + \frac{K_N}{[N]} + \frac{K_{eq,1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} [D_i][N]} \right),$$

Above it says we are using Datta & Licata's $K_{eq,1}$. Now here we also use our own expt. data to calculate $K_{eq,1}$. If our calculated $K_{eq,1}$ does not agree with Datta & Licata's results, how would we explain?

the slope of the double reciprocal plot is $\frac{K_N}{k_{cat}[E]_0[N]}$ and the intercept is

$$\frac{1}{k_{cat}[E]_0} \left(1 + \frac{K_N}{[N]} \right).$$

Of course, it is possible to simultaneously estimate both K_{eq} and K_N if, for example, an accurate value of $K_{eq,1}$ is not available. [Since the enzyme binding rate constants are much smaller than those for nucleotide binding, it is essential to provide sufficient time

Comment [SC10]: Not used, not essential due to reduction of error above