

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_CA_117903
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the Cardio-protective Activity of Agaricus bisporus in Wistar Rats Induced with Myocardial Infarction
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No. exchange with Cardio-protective Activity of Agaricus bisporus in Wistar Rats Induced with Myocardial Infarction</p> <p>It is to long authors should remove details about amount and experimental procedure. Health as keyword is also not suitable.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. Authors should present ethical permission for experiments. Then in order to conclude something they should add p values , graphs and data in such way are irrelevant. As well authors should explain how they induced myocardial infraction. Experimental design should be explained in details as well as rationale behind it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, authors should correct all language and typographical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bozidarka Zaric
Department, University & Country	Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Serbia