

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_94510</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cardio-protective Effect of the Leaf Extract of Andrographis paniculata in Isoproterenol-Induced Myocardial Infarction</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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:

(<https://www.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author should reduce the description of Andrographis paniculata extract and increase its pharmacological content in the abstract</li> <li>2. When using mass spectrometry to analyze drug components, it is necessary to mark the basic information of the relevant instruments used, such as model, place of origin, etc</li> <li>3. In the action tables of figs. 1 and 2, it should be the content rather than the activity, so the method of expressing the ordinate should be revised.</li> <li>4. It seems that such data obtained from animals in the dose experimental center of animals do not meet the conventional requirements, and it should be at least 4 to 5 to have explanatory significance.</li> <li>5. In the experimental data of each group, there is a significant difference, but it is less than 0.05, 0.01 and so on, which should be explained in the figure or in the description, and the explanation of the legend should be strengthened.</li> <li>6. Why are the experimental data listed in the table not compared accordingly?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using a flow chart to illustrate the design of the experiment makes the information more readable</li> <li>2. Why was the blood pressure of the adapted animal measured only on day 17? If we start the experiment again and continue to measure it until the end of the experiment, it will be more meaningful to observe the changes of animal blood pressure, cardiac function and the effect of drugs.</li> <li>3. And in the figure of each experiment, A、 B、 C 、 D、 E. should be marked which experimental group, so that the author can further clearly understand the change of the experimental results. More importantly, if there is a difference in the comparison, the method of expressing the difference should also be described in the legend of the experiment.</li> <li>4. Pay special attention to whether the measurement unit of the ordinate in Figure 6 is wrong for further confirmation.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It should be described whether the supplemental blood sample was collected from the floating artery or from where the approximate number of milliliters of blood was taken.</li> <li>2. The determination method used in the biochemical analysis section should be indicated and the reference should be marked instead of the author's name, which is not consistent with the conventional case description method, or the method should be revised in time.</li> <li>3. It seems that such data obtained from animals in the four-dose experimental center of animals do not meet the conventional requirements, and it should be at least 4 to 5 to have explanatory significance</li> </ol>	

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Jingdong Xu
Department, University & Country	Capital Medical University, China