

Journal Name:	Journal of Medicine and Health Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOMHR_12528
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Serpina3n, Nppa, and Anxa1 Proteins; A Review of Promising Cardiac Biomarkers for Myocardial Infarction
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Emerging biomarkers are always welcome. CVD is a major disease. Myocardial infarction is deadly and this article will help stimulate more research into the three proteins mentioned.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suggest a change in title: Exploring Serpina3n, Nppa, and Anxa1 Proteins; A Review of Promising Cardiac Biomarkers for Myocadiac Infarction <i>should preferably be:</i> Exploring Serpina3n, Nppa, and Anxa1 Proteins - Promising Cardiac Biomarkers for Myocadiac Infarction. A Narrative Review.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The article is fine.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Under 4.0 Conclusion The sentenceIt's interesting to note that all three of the proteins are readily identifiable in plasma as they are secreted. <i>should preferably be:</i>It's interesting to note that all three of the proteins (Serpina3n, Nppa, and Anxa1) are readily identifiable in plasma as they are secreted.</p>	

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article is robust and technically sound except the title should replace the word 'review' with 'narrative review'</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are fine.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Shashi Agarwal
Department, University & Country	USA