



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	