



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_46305
Title of the Manuscript:	Cardiac Myosin Heavy Chains
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<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	I guess that writing a review article is much more difficult than writing an original article and even a Case Report. This is due to the difficulty in establishing a "personal touch" even in choosing a suitable title. It is important to define a beginning (clearly establishing the "rationale" of the revision), a middle with a harmonious distribution of subitems and an end to write a "gran finale" and even concluding remarks. The present revision fails on this principle, one has the feeling of excessive "cut & paste" and the references could be update	Introduction and conclusion were add to the final draft as requested.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	