



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?)*
- 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)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- 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)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- 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 <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)</i>
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	The reference Sant'Ana et al. (2008) Biochem Pharmacol 76, 279-288, should be deleted, since this particular publication had been reported to contain plagiarism and was withdrawn by the Journal Editor and the corresponding author. Below I transcribe the message displayed by the journal when the reference is accessed: This article has been retracted at the request of the Editor-in-Chief and Author. Please see Elsevier Policy on Article Withdrawal (http://www.elsevier.com/locate/withdrawalpolicy). Reason: The authors have plagiarized transmission electron microscopy figures published by others in <i>Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.</i>, 47 (2003) 1895–1901; doi:10.1128/AAC.47.6.1895-1901.2003). As such this article represents a severe abuse of the scientific publishing system. The scientific community takes a very strong view on this matter and we apologize to readers of the journal for this incident.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>Corresponding author at:</i> Departamento de Análises Clínicas, Toxicológicas e Bromatológicas, Faculdade de Ciências Farmacêuticas de Ribeirão Preto, Universidade de São Paulo – USP, Avenida do Café, s/nº, 14040-903, Ribeirão Preto-SP, Brazil. Tel.: +55 16 36024714; fax: +55 16 36024725.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the legends for Figs. 1 and 2, indicate venom amount used in the assay so the reader does not have to refer to M&M.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The antiviral and antibacterial effects (in vitro) of some snake venoms is presented in this manuscript. The observation that snake venoms contain antimicrobial components is not entirely new, and also the concept that L-amino acid oxidase and phospholipase A2 may be associated with such activity has already been shown in several studies. Nevertheless, the data presented may be of some interest as a starting point for the isolation and characterization of the antimicrobial components of the snake venoms studied. The methods used are clearly described and results are adequately presented. The Discussion may be excessive in details, considering the descriptive nature of the study. In general the manuscript is well written, and I would only indicate a couple of minor points to be addressed.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Note: Anonymous Reviewer