



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
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 (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	-In this work, the authors study of the antimicrobial activity of different snake venoms on strains of bacteria and virus. This interesting study, however the profile is very similar to the other snake venoms described in literature but the results are nevertheless important to communicate, in order to have a view of the diversity of venoms. The manuscript requires revisions which are described above. -The methods used are adequate to achieve the proposed goals; however, The authors made the enzymatic activity of LAAO e PLA₂, but the study of viral and antibacterial action is conducted only with total venom. It was confused. The authors determined the enzymatic activity of which poisons ... authors need to clarify this point. -In results, the figures and tables are appropriate to demonstrate the results. However, the values referring to the percentage of inhibition of bacterial growth by venoms action should be presented in comparison with the results obtained for the positive control. -In results section, in the cytotoxicity study, the authors did not have a control. The authors also do not mention the statistical	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	test used for cytotoxicity and antibacterial study. This should be included in the manuscript. -The references cited in the text are relevant and adequate, however the authors should include in the list of references Torres et al. (2010). - The conclusion is supported by the results presented. -The caption of the figures and table need to be improved.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-In abstract, the conclusion should be modified based on the conclusion section. -Figures 1, 2, 3, and table 1. Please add statistical test used to the legend and explain what was compared. -The values referring to the percentage of inhibition of bacterial growth by venoms action should be presented in comparison with the results obtained for the positive control. - As the authors explain the different concentration of the venom studied. -The authors should be included in the manuscript the statistical test used for cytotoxicity and antibacterial study. - The authors should include in the list of references Torres et al. (2010). -The caption of the figures and table need to be improved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Note: Anonymous Reviewer