



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1904
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk factors associated with two viperid snake bites in Sri Lanka: a case control study.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: 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)
General comment:	Interesting investigation, some misspellings, English needs to be improved / corrections necessary	-
Specific comments:	Risk assessment in this field seems very important, publications are rare; thus it seems worth to encourage people to publish	-
Title and abstract	Reading the paper this does not deal with two viperid snake bites but with bites due to two viperid snakes – thus the title is misleading; Abstract line 15: those with "T"; Keywords line 25: Russell's viper (the "r" is missing)	Corrected: Title was changed and spellings corrected
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Is is not clear where the statement line 35 -37 refers to: most snake bites in Sri Lanka, Asia, globally?	Corrected: as ".....snake bites in Sri Lanka."
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Some of the citations – although important – are older then 10 years. And there are newer ones: e.g. Parallels between Russell's viper (<i>Daboia russelii</i>) and hump-nosed viper (<i>Hypnale species</i>) bites in the central hills of Sri Lanka amidst the heavy burden of unidentified snake bites. Kularatne K, Budagoda S, Maduwage K, Naser K, Kumarasiri R, Kularatne S. Asian Pac J Trop Med. 2011 Jul;4(7):564-7. Frequent and potentially fatal envenoming by hump-nosed pit vipers (<i>Hypnale hypnale</i> and <i>H. nepa</i>) in Sri Lanka: lack of effective antivenom. Ariaratnam CA, Thuraisingam V, Kularatne SA, Sheriff MH, Theakston RD, de Silva A, Warrell DA. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2008 Nov;102(11):1120-6. Epub 2008 May 2. Snake bites in north east Sri Lanka. Whitehall JS, Yarlani, Arunthathy, Varan, Kaanthan, Isaivanan, Vanprasath. Rural Remote Health. 2007 Oct-Dec;7(4):751. Epub 2007 Dec 12.	Corrected: New references were included
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be	Line 60: So in each of the cases the snake was killed and identified? There should be an addition comment on that.	Cases were recruited prospectively from patients with RV and HNV bites



SDI Review Form 1.5

provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)		presented with offending snake. Patients who presented without the snake were not included in the study as the snake authentication could not be made.
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?)	Line 83: 57% is NOT the majority (if you stratify with age) – this confers to the 30 yrs. In between 20 to 50 yoa. So 43% are left for the age groups 15-20 and 50-70, i.e. this percentage relates to 25 years and is in comparison even more (stratified to age groups). In the listing of significant and non significant factors at the end of the chapter “being under the influence of alcohol” is missing. Line 109/110: not wearing wearing protective foot wear is mentioned despite the fact this was no significant risk factor.	Corrected: as “... of them 57% was between the ages of 20 to 50 years.” Corrected: “being under the influence of alcohol” was included Corrected: “Wearing protective foot wear” statement was removed
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?		-
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)	“being in outdoor places” is missing	Corrected: “being in outdoor places” was added
References	As already mentioned there are – even for this very focused investigation – some more references that should be listed	Corrected: References were added