



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_10394
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-venom Activity of Mucuna pruriens Leaves Extract Against Cobra Snake (Naja hannah) Venom
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. The introduction and discussion references are not updated (the most updated it's from 2007);</p> <p>2. The introduction it's quite simple, should be more deep in the subject;</p> <p>3 The lines 242 and 243 again repeat the data from table 3. It's necessary just cite "table 3";</p> <p>4 The discussion must be more explored and get more infos from the data, and give support from this obtained data.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. There are some grafhy errors, like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - line 6 and 80 "Naja Hannah" and should be "Naja Hanna"; - line 42 " anaylatic" and should be "anaphylactic"; - line 75 "by (Guerranti et al." and should be "by Guerranti et al. (2002)"; - line 243 and 251 "mucuna prurien" and should be "Mucuna prurien"; <p>2 In the line 143 the author forgot to put the abbreviation - ALT, so it's quite hard to understand what is meaning in the other lines. The same problem</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>happens in the line 146 with AST.</p> <p>3 In the lines 176 e 177 the description it's same information that in table 3;</p> <p>4 The table 4a and 4b could be better in just one table, as the same 5a and 5b together.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>1. The material and methods are according to the realise studies and could be reproduced in another moment or study.</p> <p>2. The conclusion is supported by the data.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniela Priscila Marchi-Salvador
Department, University & Country	Department of Molecular Biology, Federal University of Paraiba, Brazil.