



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BMRJ/2091
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Profile of Selected Snake Venoms and their associated enzymatic activities.

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: (Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)

- Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)

Despite the fact that the objective of this work may be considered important, this is not an original study, since the content of this manuscript has been previously presented. The relationship between enzyme activities observed in some snake venoms (as LAAO and PLA₂) and antimicrobial activity is well established. Moreover, in this manuscript, the authors were unable to correlate the enzymatic activity and antimicrobial profile as suggested by the title. The author must write more specific information about the enzyme activities.

The title was already changed and we were concerned mainly with evaluation of the antimicrobial potentials of tested venoms.

- Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)

However, the methodology described for testing the activity for L-amino acid oxidase does not match the one described by Lee et al.

Also, the reference "Berridge et al., 2005" does not apply to the context referenced and can be discarded.

How the snake venoms were collected and stored?

How the viral and bacterial cultures were stored?

The reference for testing the activity for L-amino acid oxidase was corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

The reference "Berridge et al., 2005" was discarded as you kindly recommended
Snake venoms were collected in VACSERA animal farm through milking using a latex membrane stretched over a glass container. After venom collection, it was dried and stored at -20 °C.

Viral strains were propagated on Vero cells and stored in culture media containing 10% fetal bovine serum at – 70 °C.

Newly subcultured (18 - 20 h) bacterial strains were preserved in broth media containing 20 % glycerol and stored at at – 70 °C.

Results & discussion:

- 1. Are the data well controlled and robust?

Yes, because the data of the experiments are from tests done independently and in triplicate, following well-defined protocols with minor adaptations. However, note that some of the poisons used to test antimicrobial not tested for antiviral activity.

Some of the venoms tested as antimicrobials not tested for antiviral activity as the present work was a part of our project that aimed at evaluation of different biological activities of snake venoms thus a group of test venoms was selected for each issue.

- 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion.

The authors should use updated references.

Revised as you kindly recommended where 9 new references between 2011-2012 were added to this manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

- 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out.
Unfortunately the information obtained by the authors are poor, precluding more precise conclusions.

Thanks, I appreciate your point of view but I need to refer that the present work was a preliminary study and according to our results further studies will be performed.

- 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)
Yes, statistical tests were performed, as has been shown in table 1: "N. haje venom didn't show significant viral depletion rate against test viruses $P = .05$ ".
The statistical analyzes performed are appropriate. P value should be presented as ≤ 0.05 .

Thanks a lot, it was revised as you kindly reported

- Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)
Unfortunately this work is somewhat conclusive due to the results being superficial.

We changed the tile and the aim of the present study according to the practical work performed

- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
References cited are relevant and appropriate. However, considering that only 8 of the 32 references cited are between the years 2009 to 2011, it is suggested to include references updated
It is also added that the formatting of some references are not standardized, for example in lines 325 and other incorrect (line 290).

Thanks a lot, formatting was revised as you kindly reported and 10 new references were added

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	No comments.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No comments.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	We suggest refuse this manuscript because its content is not original and is better presented in other manuscripts already published	Thanks a lot for your point of view but we hope to refer that although the work is not innovation but our local strains of snakes may differ and it is well known that there are species variation from country to another as in France and Saudi Arabia. Both have snake venoms and in Egypt as well but the activities of venoms are variable.