

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	

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, this manuscript holds significance for the scientific community due to its exploration of the potential cardio-protective effects of Agaricus bisporus in an experimental model of myocardial infarction. Given the global prevalence of cardiovascular diseases and the need for alternative therapeutic approaches, this study provides valuable insights into the potential benefits of a natural remedy. The findings could contribute to the development of novel treatments or preventive strategies for cardiovascular diseases, thus addressing a critical health concern worldwide. 2. yes .It clearly indicates the subject (Agaricus bisporus), the experimental model (Wistar rats), and the condition being studied (myocardial infarction). 3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It succinctly presents the rationale for investigating Agaricus bisporus leaf extract's cardio-protective effects, outlines the experimental procedures, highlights significant results regarding lipid profiles and LDH activities, and concludes with implications for cardiovascular health and potential applications of the extract. Overall, the abstract effectively summarizes the study's essential aspects and findings. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate and well-organized. The Introduction provides a clear overview of the importance of studying myocardial infarction and introduces the potential benefits of Agaricus bisporus. The Materials and Methods section details the experimental procedures, including sample collection, extraction, animal studies, and biochemical assays, providing sufficient information for reproducibility. The Results section presents the findings in a structured manner with accompanying figures, facilitating comprehension. The Discussion section effectively interprets the results, linking them to existing literature and discussing the potential mechanisms underlying the observed effects. Overall, the manuscript's structure facilitates understanding and adheres to standard scientific reporting conventions. 5. Yes 6. 3, 14, 20,26, 27 (old references) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from refinement. Ensure consistent terminology, clear sentence structure, and proper grammar. Logical flow and detailed descriptions in the methodology and results sections are crucial. Proofreading and peer review can further enhance readability and clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable research on the cardioprotective effects of Agaricus bisporus extract on myocardial infarction. The study design and methodology are robust, but the manuscript would benefit from improved clarity and coherence. Consistent terminology, refined sentence structure, and detailed statistical explanations are needed. Additionally, the discussion should logically flow from the results. With these revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field.</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:	Shazia Nazar
Department, University & Country	Dow University of Health Sciences, Pakistan