

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_70146
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Naja nigricollis (Elapidae) venom on some vital organs of Oryctolagus cuniculus
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I reviewed the manuscript entitled Effect of <i>Naja nicrollis</i> (Elapidae) venom on some organs of Oryctolagus. The research presents some descriptive aspects observed on some rabbit organs after be inoculated with venom of <i>Naja nicrollis</i>. The consequences of bite of venomous-snakes is an important topic for several human populations, so research focused on it is highly relevant. I have, however, many concerns on this manuscript that need be resolved.</p> <p>The first aspect is the ethical. The authors mentioned an approbation of an ethic committee but no details provide of this committee. The type of research requires a careful and detailed report of the ethical aspects.</p> <p>The manuscript is submitted as an original research article, but I consider a lot of work need to be published. The aspects are the followings.</p> <p>The introduction must to have elements to understand why the authors decide to use heart, lungs, liver and kidneys. Likewise, the characteristics of the venom type must be mentioned, as well as the current knowledge of consequences of these venom types. In fact, such background could allow to generate a hypothesis.</p> <p>The methods have few details to clarify the acclimation of the rabbits, the dose of venom (the affections could vary depending on the animal weight, so it is important to taken into account this aspect), the timing of the different processes, the euthanasia processes, and the characteristics that would be visually estimated (based on literature).</p> <p>The results must be very detailed because the sample size does not allow to have statistical results. The few number of observed organs requires a detailed description and report of the visual characteristics estimated. The images must to be clear, as well as to allow comparison so the organ position and distance from the camera must to be the same. The organ weight must to be size-adjusted to compare between males and females, so it is necessary to report the size of the rabbits, and avoid to use ranges since the research was made with very few individuals.</p> <p>In the discussion, the authors must to comment the characteristics observed in the organs and discuss the possible explanations of the observed modifications, this means, to realize a link between the results and the literature.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors may find specific comments directly on the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	A revision of the English language is needed.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The authors mentioned an ethical committee but no details are provided, and because the research type, details are very important.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Héctor Hugo Siliceo Cantero</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México</i>