



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>)

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	The authors report significant cardioprotective effects of enalapril when administered prior to continued exposure to isoproterenol; these findings are based on assessment of a number of biomarkers in tissues from rats exposed to different treatments (3 groups – controls, isoproterenol, enalapril + isoproterenol). The Introduction is not focused (at times it is quite repetitive) and lacks a workable hypothesis. The Discussion section is too long and lacks clarity – it is not necessary to reiterate the entire literature to justify the results obtained in these studies. No mention is made of pharmacologic conditioning – pretreatment with enalapril prior to isoproterenol insult constitutes a form of preconditioning that should be addressed by the authors.	Noted
Minor REVISION comments	One of the major difficulties of this manuscript is that there is a great deal of repetition; the authors should carefully read the paper to eliminate these repetitions. The rationale for drug conditioning should be addressed. There are minor typographical errors in the text. The figure legends of the photomicrographs should indicate the tissue stain employed; in Figure 13 it is no evident that the B frame is an H&E stained section – though the magnification is indicated it does not appear consistent for all of the frames. Figure 15 looks off – particularly frame A. In the Discussion references are not consistent (cf. 11 vs 28)	
Optional/General comments		