



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_66052
Title of the Manuscript:	Short and Long-Term Exposure to Biomass Fuel (wood smoke) and Its Effects on Cardiovascular Risk Markers and Lipid Peroxidation of Male Albino Rats.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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	<p>I am grateful to review this manuscript, given the relevance of the topic to public health. However, some repairs need to be carried out. A list of suggested repairs is described below:</p> <p><b>1 Summary:</b></p> <p>1.1 In the methods section there are acronyms without a description of their meaning. It is recommended that when using an acronym for the first time, it is enclosed in parentheses after the complete description of the term it represents.</p> <p>1.2 The results section states that "although these effects appear to be more pronounced with six weeks of exposure". This sentence gives the idea that the results were not able to answer the objectives of the study.</p> <p><b>2 Methods:</b></p> <p>2.1 Did the study protocol go through any Ethics Committee for the Use of Animals?</p> <p><b>3 Discussion:</b></p> <p>3.1 Results data need to be better discussed.</p> <p>3.2 There was no comparison / comparison between the 3rd and 6th week of analysis.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript is highly relevant to public health. However, some repairs need to be carried out.	
<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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes. The methodology does not include approval of the protocol by an ethics committee on research using animals.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Welma Emidio Da Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brazil</b>