



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_16297
Title of the Manuscript:	Descriptive analysis of Ebolavirus proteins: towards development of effective therapies
Type of Article:	Review Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Authors have responded to most of the suggestions quite well and have revised the manuscript thoroughly. There are a couple of sections that could still benefit from attention. 669-691 does not seem to be citing current and past literature in terms of - laboratory bat infections with Filoviruses, - the current epicentre and its potential link to a bat origin (insectivorous rather than fruit bats are thought to be potential suspects here) - studies of bat immunology - bat serology in identifying widespread potential for Ebola virus - studies of other hosts have been performed, perhaps not using the latest modern methods of today but the literature has been out there for a while now. 654-667 might benefit from suggesting combinations of treatment but not necessarily the i and ii suggested as there are quite a few combinations that have already been tried. 655-656 is not really true since - VSV vaccines have shown promising efficacy with low pass challenges - Cocktails of neutralizing antibodies have shown resolution of EVD in NH (Qiu et al., Nature)	Thank you so much for all the suggestions, criticisms and comments. Your contributions have made me a better writer and will be valuable for my future endeavours even for my PhD studies in the near future. Section 669-691 has been revised and all the appropriate references have been added including references for studies on bat immunology, insectivorous free tailed bats. The section now has a different outlook. See line 647-677 and reference 179-185 Thank you so much. The suggested combinations have been removed. We have just emphasised the need for combination of treatments (see line 645-650) Thank you. We agree with you although the line was meant to highlight the fact that the adverse reactions resulting from injecting high volumes of IFNs can be reduced by use of adenovirus vectored IFNs (See ref. 159). Line 655-656 has been deleted together with the suggested combinations.