



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_41909
Title of the Manuscript:	To establish the interrelationship between vitamin D status and acute 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)																								
Compulsory REVISION comments	The heading “To establish the interrelationship between vitamin D status and 4 acute coronary artery disease.” Should be rewritten. Suggestion: “the relation of vitamin D status and presence of acute coronary syndrome in patients with....” The abstract should not include any name of institution. The abstract should be re-written in a format of aim, method, results and conclusion. Abbreviations in text and the abstract should be written in the long forms in the first place they used. At least three keywords in total should be added. References in the text should be in accordance with the journal format. the aim of the study was not clearly mentioned in the text. the selection method of the subjects was not mentioned (retrospective, prospective, cross-sectional, case-control etc). The type of ACS is not clear (criteria for the diagnosis). Type of statistical analysis performed for the data should be mentioned in the text. There is no data about age, weight, height, BMI etc. There is no clear definition for insufficient, deficient, sufficient level of vitamin D status. The results and conclusions are irrelevant.	I have made necessary correction in publication, please go through I have highlighted correction & done the needful. Baseline characteristics of study population <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Baseline characteristics</th> <th>Case (Mean±SD)</th> <th>Control (Mean±SD)</th> <th>P value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td>47.8±10.3</td> <td>45.4±11.1</td> <td>0.266</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BMI</td> <td>26.89±4.75</td> <td>23.93±3.42</td> <td>0.001</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pulse</td> <td>82.7±17.4</td> <td>76.98±4.04</td> <td>0.025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SBP</td> <td>127.8±24.6</td> <td>117.60±8.47</td> <td>0.007</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DBP</td> <td>86.80±13.0</td> <td>75.80±4.76</td> <td>0.000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Table 1 show basic characteristics of study subjects, mean age of the cases were 47.8±10.3 and that of controls were 45.4±11.1. Mean BMI of cases were 26.89±4.75 and of control were 23.93±3.42. SBP and DBP were show significant correlation.	Baseline characteristics	Case (Mean±SD)	Control (Mean±SD)	P value	Age	47.8±10.3	45.4±11.1	0.266	BMI	26.89±4.75	23.93±3.42	0.001	Pulse	82.7±17.4	76.98±4.04	0.025	SBP	127.8±24.6	117.60±8.47	0.007	DBP	86.80±13.0	75.80±4.76	0.000
Baseline characteristics	Case (Mean±SD)	Control (Mean±SD)	P value																							
Age	47.8±10.3	45.4±11.1	0.266																							
BMI	26.89±4.75	23.93±3.42	0.001																							
Pulse	82.7±17.4	76.98±4.04	0.025																							
SBP	127.8±24.6	117.60±8.47	0.007																							
DBP	86.80±13.0	75.80±4.76	0.000																							
Minor REVISION comments																										
Optional/General comments																										