SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/IJBcRR/1622**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Association of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Insertion/Deletion Polymorphism with Hypertension in Dyslipidemic Egyptian Patients with Coronary Artery Disease.**

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)

SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)*
General comment:	This is a interesting study on the association of angiotensin-converting enzyme Insertion/Deletion polymorphism with hypertension in dyslipidemic Egyptian patients with coronary artery disease.	
Specific comments:	However, some contents should be carefully revised.	
Title and abstract	Please mark the data of (P=0.004, OR= 0.419, 95% CI (0.2-0.8)), (P= 0.008, OR= 0.475, 95% CI (0.27-0.84) . whether they are for D allele, DD genotype, I allele or ID genotype.	Corrected
Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*	Please delete the repetitive label in the introduction. Such as insertion/deletion (I/D), it was repetitive labelled in the introduction.	Corrected
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The I allele or a D allele and forms 3 possible genotypes: II, ID, and DD. (Zhou TB, Liu YG, Lin N, Qin YH, Huang K, Shao MB, Peng DD. Relationship between angiotensin-converting enzyme insertion/deletion gene polymorphism and systemic Lupus Erythematosus/Lupus Nephritis: a systematic review and metaanalysis. J Rheumatol. 2012 Apr;39(4):686-93.) This sentence and current reference should be added in the third paragraph.	Corrected
Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*	1. Please add the method for ELISA determination, and how you keep the homogeneity of determination. 2. Sometimes, PCR determination for genotype might present false positive. Whether the author confirmed the mutation using other method? Such as sequencing.	-The reference of ELISA determination is now cited. (corrected) -We did not make any confirmation
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	There was a notable difference for the baseline data of the age between the CAD cases group and control group (Table 1). The results for the comparisons for TG, TC, HDL, VLDL, etc. might be less robust. Please add the limitation in the "Discussion".	-The difference is attributed to the wide ranges of both groups. -Corrected
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	None.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	None.	
References	It is OK!	