SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	**My notes are as follows:** **1. Grammar needs much revision.** **2. Article needs to rewrite, our software detects 46% plagiarism.** **3. Abbreviations should be spelled out in the first appearance both in abstract and text.** **4. In abstract, major concern in method and result was missed.** **5. 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.** **6. Eligibility criteria should be included in the method, and the reports of patients exclusion should be explained in results accompanied by a flowchart.** **7. What criteria are used by authors to diagnose CAD?** **8. 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.** **9. 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.** **10. 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.** **11. 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.** **12. Authors should make a more thorough comparison comprehensively.** **13. Authors should add some standard items such as clinical implication and study limitation.** **Plagiarism issue:** **Our software detects 46% plagiarism.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Jonny Karunia Fajar***
Department, University & Country	***School of Medicine, Syiah Kuala University, Indonesia***