



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_11870
Title of the Manuscript:	Arginase as a new cardiac marker for diagnosis of coronary artery disease
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. How MI and UA were diagnosed should be written clearly. EKG changes of elevated ST MI should be specified in the method section. 2. The biochemical measurement methods of AST, CK-MB and arginase , the names of the devices and their manufactures should be stated in the method section. 3. How serum samples were obtained and stored should be written in detail and how long after the cardiac events were the serum sample taken should be noted in the method section. 4. Why troponin level was not measured, if it was measured it should be stated in the method, result and discussion sections. If it was not measured it should be written in the study limitation section and it should be stated that this study is a pilot study and the need for further studies should be emphasized. The limited number of the study subjects should be emphasized. 5. In the discussion section "This indicates that like AST and CK-MB, arginase also increases with severity of the disease ACS" sentence is incorrect. High levels of AST and CK-MB do not reflect the severity of MI. This sentence may be helpful in early diagnosis.	1. The individuals under study were selected after clinical examination by cardiologist on the basis of ECG reports. 2. The optical densities were measured spectrophotometrically and activities of enzymes were calculated. 3. mentioned in the text. 4. Limitations of the study: Troponin levels were not measured. It was a pilot study and followup study with large sample size can be done. 5. This indicates that like AST and CKMB, arginase activity was increased. Thus it may be helpful in early diagnosis of ACS. 6. Correction done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Additionally it may be suitable if it is rewritten as it may be a prognostic factor for next studies with broad population and long-term mortality studies. The present data does not indicate this result. 6. In the abstract method the details of the abbreviations should be written.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		