



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Overall, English has to be revised. It is hard to read because there are too many errors. 2. In the context of terminology, the authors have to be consistent. (eg. CK-MB, Ck, ck, CK MB etc.) They have to define the abbreviations when the full name terms show up for the first time. 3. They showed correlation between cord blood CK-MB levels and type of delivery. It is significant. However, that's it. The information obtained in this study is too limited.	Thank you about these valuable comments. 1. We tried to clarify it and correct errors. 2. It was corrected 3. We Assessed APGAR score and total CK levels and we didn't find correlation between these variables and delivery condition. We also find limited related new studies.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Style of "References" has to be revised. It lacks consistency. 2. It needs correction in the text, too.	1. We corrected it 2. It was revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		