



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 work is killed in search	To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time to study the link between ACE (genetics), Lp(a) and IL6 (ELISA) in CAD Egyptian population with different complications.
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	The title includes hypertension, which is not clarified in patient selection if the patients were hypertensive or not. The same comment is for dyslipidemia. I suggest to remove hypertension and dyslipidemia from the title.	Corrected: hypertension and dyslipidemia have been deleted from the title.
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Coronary artery disease (CAD) must be explained with its degrees of severity to determine the clinically evidenced basis on which the patients were selected.	Corrected Lines (42-44), lines (74/75)
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?		
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-inclusion and exclusion criteria for patient selection should be clarified. 2-where are the clinical data of the patients? 3- Other risk factors for developing CAD like obesity and smoking.	Corrected (section 2.1, lines 74-79) 1- Ischemic heart disease patients are included, with the exclusion of those with hepatitis B or C. 2- To avoid increasing the number of tables , we presented them in words and numbers. We mentioned the number of those with hypertension, with hyperlipidemia and with diabetes mellitus. 3- We mentioned that all patients are obese and only males are smokers
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?)	1- Table 1 is useless as it is stated that controls are healthy , how can we compare all things with nothing? 2- In table2: the Median(Q₁ – Q₃) values for controls were not present why?	1- the control group was selected as healthy subjects to be used for comparison with patients 2- Because the control data are normally distributed. Therefore, it is expressed as mean±SD. <i>Only non-normally distributed data are presented in Median(Q₁ – Q₃)</i>



SDI Review Form 1.5

	3- Statistical analysis should be corrected, in tables 4,5,6, hypertension, diabetes and hyperlipidemia must be expressed as numerical values eg: fasting bold glucose, cholesterol , triglycerides levels and so on. 4- The authors excluded patients with hepatitis B or C virus infection, I want to hear in discussion part the cause for this exclusion.	3- corrected 4- corrected: lines (230-234) + we added a reference (lines: 355-357)
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	
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)	It is ok ,	
References		