



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the secondary causes of hypertension (Table 1), author need to put references for each causes.</li> <li>Line 142-143 needs references.</li> <li>"Therapeutic intervention targeting the RAAS" para needs more information with proper references. Author need to explain/state current therapeutic medicine targeting RAAS and also current therapeutic development targeting MAS receptor or Ang 1-7.</li> <li>Abstract and Discussion part contains some statement of the hypertension scenario of Sudan. Author needs to provide some concrete data from some reliable sources in order to justify the importance of Ang 1-7 particularly for Sudanise population. The way author state is just a speculation. It should be back up by proper data and references.</li> <li>Author need to explain more elaborately about the relationship between Ang 1-7 WITH ROS.</li> <li>Author need to provide more details regarding current research finding of Ang 1-7 and MAS receptor.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditionally accepted the classical pathway of activation of the RAAS (Figure 1) need to elaborately explained with proper references.</li> <li>All small paragraphs should be under a big paragraph.</li> <li>Figure 1 &amp; 2 should be drawn in more elegant way.</li> <li>Author can omit the discussion part and state all information under Conclusion. A review article barely contain a paragraph titled DISCUSSION.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Md Afjalus Siraj</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Hawai'i at Hilo, USA</i></b>