



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_8394
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Levels of Total Creatine Kinase and MB-isoenzyme in Cord Blood between Vaginal Delivery and Cesarean Section
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	-Actually the conclusion of this study and the absence of correlation between Apgar and increased CK and CK-MB in NVD should be supported by other recent studies. It is well known that Caesarean Section is recently related to brain neurodevelopment disorders like autism. -The significant increase of CK-MB in NVD must find support with other studies. It seems from the conclusion that CS delivery is recommended to avoid brain damage which might be occur during NVD. -The study is very simple; however the scientific merit of the manuscript could be increased by a stronger discussion of the obtained data.	Thank you about these recommendations. - We revised our manuscript on the basis on your comments: study of Polo-Kantola was added in discussion (Reference No 27) and - we also emphasized that increased CK-MB is probably due to muscle strain during NVD not brain damage. - We tried to correct spelling and grammar errors and improved our discussion.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: 1-CK in the background must be expanded and then abbreviated along the manuscript. 2- A brief definition of <u>Apgar score</u> should be written in the introduction for readers who are not familiar to this term. 3- Activity of CK must be expressed in U/L not u/l 4- In the Discussion several factor must be several factors. 5- English language along the manuscript must be polished.	1- It described in background 2- We described it in abstract 3- It corrected 4- It corrected 5- We tried to improve it.
Optional/General comments		