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	**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.**	
Minor REVISION comments	**1. Style of "References" has to be revised. It lacks consistency.** **2. It needs correction in the text, too.**	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer