

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74453
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING AND IN SILICO VALIDATION OF ANTI-MICROBIAL PEPTIDES DERIVED FROM LYSOSTAPHIN, ENTERO AND ENDOLYSIN
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>)

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>This is a useful study that attempts to describe the process of identifying AMPs from lysostaphin, enterolysin and endolysin using web-based predictive tools. Unfortunately, there is no workflow to document what were the selection criteria used and the I/O at each stage in the analysis. For example, AMPA reveals the position of aa's with AMP activity from which a peptide can be selected. How was this information further use din the selection process, if at all? For example, for lysostaphin using the WEKA selection in dPABB 40 AMPs with anti-biofilm activity are identified. How were these leads further filtered to select the 3 peptides that the authors consider? Another shortcoming of the paper is the suggestion that the peptides predicted to have anti-biofilm activity have demonstrated in vivo or even therapeutic potential. Evidence needs to be presented to support these statements, otherwise the statements should be removed</p> <p><i>"These peptides have been used or tested against common pathogens associated with hospital acquired infections. The present study is first of its kind to identify the potential properties of a therapeutic lead intended for use in dental settings"</i></p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The study is publishable pending the inclusion of a figure documenting the workflow used in the analysis and the data yields at each step in the filtration funnel, as well as a description of why the particular peptides were considered among many others.</p> <p>The study is publishable pending the inclusion of a figure documenting the workflow used in the analysis and the data yields at each step in the filtration funnel, as well as a description of why the particular peptides were considered among many others.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Serban San-Marina
Department, University & Country	University of Toronto, Canada