



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	MS_JAMPS_26502
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on target-specificity and biological activity of Streptococcus serum antibody and amikacin sulfate conjugates
Type of the 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Methods and chemical basis for making the anti-sera- amikacin sulfate conjugates must be given in more details; 2) Mice were applied to validate the rabbit anti-Streptococcus serum antibody and amikacin sulfate conjugates. Data about potential mouse anti-rabbit xenogenic responses must be analysed and presented in this study before drawing any conclusion; 3) Streptococcus challenge experiment should 	<p>We have added the process of making this conjugates in detail accordingly.</p> <p>We fully agree and added such analysis results in the discussion part accordingly.</p> <p>We fully agree and added one in the discussion part accordingly.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>have generated more data, such as systemic infection and local infection, especially lung infection. Since the conjugate is much larger than non-conjugated drug alone, it is questionable about whether the conjugate form is better than the free drug in protection of systemic infection and the distal lung infection, etc. These points must be discussed based on the data obtained.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) Please clarify the following experimental design. “<i>Streptococcus</i>” and the “conjugates” are not comparable for an immunogenicity study.</p> <p>“171 Conjugates decrease <i>Streptococcus</i> serum antibody immunogenicity</p> <p>172 Specific antiserum was generated by immunizing rabbits with either <i>Streptococcus</i> or the</p> <p>173 conjugates.”</p> <p>2) Please check the following. Should it be 0.2mL/mouse”?</p> <p>“120 and then injected intraperitoneally (i.p.) into the mice (0.2 mL/<i>rabbit</i>).”</p>	<p>We fully agree and modified “<i>Streptococcus</i>”as“<i>Streptococcus</i> serum antibody”accordingly. We modified the following sentences as follows:</p> <p>Modified: Coupling decrease <i>Streptococcus</i> serum antibody immunogenicity.</p> <p>We thank the reviewer for the carefulness and modified as 0.2mL/mouse accordingly.</p>
Optional/General comments		