



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_39936
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of C677T polymorphism of Methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase (MTHFR) gene and it's susceptibility in 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>)

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	<p>My notes are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar needs much revision. Article needs to rewrite, our software detects 46% plagiarism. Abbreviations should be spelled out in the first appearance both in abstract and text. In abstract, major concern in method and result was missed. Introduction was explained unsystematically (explanations of CAD risk factors and the role of MTHFR are complicated). Please revise introduction to be more precise and sharp. Eligibility criteria should be included in the method, and the reports of patients exclusion should be explained in results accompanied by a flowchart. What criteria are used by authors to diagnose CAD? Inconsistency between method and results was noted. In method, authors explained that "controls were age and sex-matched healthy individuals". This means that age and gender between case and control should be not much different. But, in results, mean age between case and control was significantly difference. Authors should revise this inconsistency. CAD is a complex, consisting of various conditions, and each condition has a different prognosis. This paper will be more interesting if the author explains the gene polymorphism in CAD subgroup. There are several biased factors in results. One or two factors may have little or no effect, but if four or more factors mean something difficult to explain. Authors explained the association unclearly. Authors should state explicitly about which allele or genotype, correlated with vulnerability or protection against CAD. The statement should be clear. Authors should make a more thorough comparison comprehensively. Authors should add some standard items such as clinical implication and study limitation. <p>Plagiarism issue:</p> <p>Our software detects 46% plagiarism.</p>	<p>We had tried to follow a systemic manner like general introduction of CAD, then various factors which causes CAD(like genetic and environmental), then in next paragraph its prevalence in India , then about MTHFR gene and finally particular SNP.</p> <p>We had tried to correlate various parameters to each other and important once, were a good significance can be found has been included in the article.</p> <p>All the patients were selected by special cardiologist.</p> <p>Patients were diagnosed by angiogram mentioned in text.</p> <p>The line mentioning controls were age and sex-matched healthy individuals". Is removed from the text.</p> <p>Definitely we had focused only CAD patients but sometimes during medication the patients gets some complications but at the time when patients were admitted they had only CAD.</p> <p>As per the data availability and the results manipulation the statistical tools was used like p-value.</p> <p>Study limitations added.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		