



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_10616
Title of the Manuscript:	Radioiodination and Biological Evaluation of Epinephrine as a Possible Adrenergic receptors Imaging Agent
Type of the Article	Primary Research acticle

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	The authors state several fallacies about the sympathetic nervous system and, specifically, epinephrine, e.g. that epinephrine is released by neurons as neurotransmitter, it has higher affinity for beta- than for alpha1-receptors, and that it (only) contracts blood vessels, etc. They should read and cite the following two recent and authoritative reviews about adrenergic receptors and epinephrine in the cardiovascular system: 1) Adrenergic Nervous System in Heart Failure: Pathophysiology and Therapy. Circ. Res. 113: 739-753 (2013). 2) Adrenal adrenoceptors in heart failure: Fine-tuning cardiac stimulation. Tr. Mol. Med. 13: 503-511 (2007). They should then correct their text accordingly. In addition, radioligand binding experiments on cardiac cell membranes with their radio-iodinated epinephrine compound would further enhance the strength and validity of their conclusions, in my opinion.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the paper is interesting but needs major revision in its references and text and perhaps some further experimentation (see above: Compulsory revision comments, for details).	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer