



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_38498
Title of the Manuscript:	Cardioprotective effect of enalapril on isoproterenol-induced myocardial infarction in rats
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	<p>This paper reports that enalapril protects myocardium against myocardial infarction injury induced by isoproterenol in rats evidenced by haemodynamic, biochemical, histopathological and immunohistochemistry parameters. Although the main idea of the study shows potential interest, there are some critical points to be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About experimental protocol, Group D (enalapril treated only) should be included. 2. The cardiotoxicity assay is critical in this study. Authors should provide data showing the effect of enalapril on myocardial marker enzymes (such as LDH, CK) and cardiac functions (Hemodynamic Studies) in isoproterenol-induced myocardial infarction injury in rats. Otherwise, the data is not enough to draw the conclusion. 	<p>As at the time of this study, enalapril treated only was not included. It is difficult to include this now especially that in many studies, this group is not considered but in future studies, this will be given top consideration.</p> <p>It is true that enzymes such as LDH, CK were not assayed; the other enzymes assayed nonetheless confirm the establishment of myocardial infarction. In any case, isoproterenol induction in rats has been used as equivalent of MI in humans. Besides, we are looking at the free radical generating ability of MI in ISO induction. These and other markers have proven beyond reasonable doubt that MI was induced in this study and that enalapril has ability to ameliorate this diseased condition.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In addition, there are a number of technical and conceptual issues need to be addressed due to which the results or at least the conclusions are not so convincing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were enalapril and isoproterenol administered by intra-peritoneal route or other method? Why to choose the dose of enalapril and isoproterenol? Please describe clearly. 2. The ethics statement of animal is absent in MATERIALS AND METHODS section. In MATERIALS AND METHODS section, Catalase assay (CAT) and Estimation of lipid peroxidation assay (TBARS) were included. However, In result section, there is no the corresponding results. 3. Further amendments to figures and tables legend are suggested. For example: In Figure 4, 5, 6, 7 legends, there is "Grp A", "Grp B", "Grp C" tag, however, no the corresponding "Grp A", "Grp B", "Grp C" tag exist in Figure 4, 5, 6, 7, and so on. 4. In figures and tables, what does "a, b" stand for respectively? And P value and number of animal should be provided. 5. What is the rationale for observing CRP, PT and NPT in heart? It should be mentioned in text. 6. The picture quality is poor, Figure 15, 16 in particular, it is suggested to change the image. 7. There are many errors in grammar and typography. It is recommended to go through the paper a few more times to correct these errors. Such as, "$p < .05$" should be "$p < 0.05$". 	<p>While enalapril was administered orally, ISO was administered subcutaneously. The doses used were as found in other studies that have been carried out previously.</p> <p>Catalase and TBARS were not assayed in this study hence they were not mentioned in the results.</p> <p>The legends in figure have now been indicated.</p> <p>The superscripts 'a' and 'b' are now clearly indicated. Ditto for p values.</p> <p>The rationale for evaluating CRP, PT and NPT has been clearly stated in the discussion column.</p> <p>The picture quality have been worked on.</p> <p>The few typographical and grammatical errors have been corrected.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Although the main idea of the study shows potential interest, there are some critical points to be revised.</p>	