



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Authors must declare what there are measured! Arginase activity or arginase level. As shown the reference number 7, it is arginase activity. Therefore authors write all the "arginase/ arginase level" terms as "arginase level". Title included. 2. Introduction is too long, but explains the hypothesis and aim, clearly. Authors must added a figure legend for Fig 1., separately. In lane 46. Please write Fig.1 as (Fig1). 3. Materials and Methods: Please write the inclusion and exclusion in text as sentences. Authors must declare the inclusion and exclusion criteria also for the control group. Authors measure only CK-MB, AST and arginase activities. Therefore it is better to explain the methods in detailed form in materials methods section. Authors must explain the statistical methods. 4. Results and Discussion Firstly it is better when results and discussion sections are separated Authors must explain the demographic and anthropometric results in a table or in text of results. Authors must explain the medications from UA and MI groups, if use the control group, also in control group.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Authors must write the results in detailed form. The significance of the results is not clear. It is significant than control group or UA group, or both? As shown in lane 96, is this result from this research? But a reference number (reference 7) is given. If a relationship between your results and reference no 7 please discuss it in “discussion section”. Additionally reference 8, 9, 10,11 and 12 (lane 98). Authors declare in lane 105,106 a strong correlation, please write the correlation details. For example correlation coefficient, OR, etc. Discussion must be written in a more detailed and explanatory form. Measurements of AST, CK-MB and arginase activities cannot explain the severity of a marker. For this explanation authors must use ROC curves, and calculations for sensitivity and specificity.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	If there any ethical issue	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are some misspellings. Authors must correct it. I think it needs a substantial revision and re-writing.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Meral Yuksel
Department, University & Country	Department of Medical Laboratory, School of Health Realted Services, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey