



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_47655
Title of the Manuscript:	Angiotensin 1-7: A second window of protection in hypertensive patients
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	Paper needs revision in terms of both linguistic and some contents.	Corrections have been made to the article where felt needed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Paper will contribute to this field. However, it should be improved. More recent papers are available on https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Angiotensin+1-7 . Please refer to this link https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Angiotensin+1-7 . This will help you improve the quality and content of paper.	This is the first of many reviews to come in the renin angiotensin system.

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. NO conflict of interests