

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_130739 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Photobiomodulation Mitigates Oxidative Stress Induced by Bothrops jararacussu Venom in C2C12 Myoblast Cells |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Photobiomodulation therapy (PBMT) has emerged as an interesting bioprotective tool against snake envenomation in recent years. Low-level laser (LLL) or Light-emitting diode (LED) light has exhibited protective role in multiple in vitro and in vivo experiments. In this manuscript, the authors have studied the bioprotective role of PBMT in C2C12 myoblast cells treated with <i>Bothrops jararacussu</i> venom. Although the exact mechanism of this protective role is not fully understood, the authors tried to shed light on the role of PBMT in oxidative stress, antioxidant activity and lipid peroxidation. The study helps to push forward the current state of knowledge regarding the effect of PBMT on cellular processes. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the article is suitable. | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is comprehensive. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | References are mostly adequate. However, I would insist to add reference/s on the role of PBMT on the viability of C2C12 cells which seems missing from this manuscript. The citation should be placed in the discussion and based on the protective role of PBMT on viability of C2C12 cells and the findings of this study, the conclusions should be drawn. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The standard of English in this manuscript needs further improvement. Punctuations and grammar needs to be improved. I would suggest requesting a colleague from non-scientific background to review your manuscript for English language.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>In addition to the above comments, I would suggest the following additional comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific names (especially “<i>Bothrops</i>”) should be uniformly italicized in the manuscript 2. Section 2.2: “Dulbeccos modified Eagles medium” should be written as “Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle Medium” 3. Section 2.5: “accumulation of nitrite (NO)” should be written as “accumulation of nitrite (NO₂)” 4. Section 2.6: “H₂O production” should be written as “H₂O₂ production” 5. Section 2.6: Before writing any abbreviation, for eg. “BjssuV” the full form should be written first and then the abbreviation should be used throughout the rest of the manuscript 6. Section 2.6: “incubated at 370°C in a 5% CO” should be written as “incubated at 37°C in a 5% CO₂” 7. Section 2.7: Reference “[23]” should be written in (Author, Year) format 8. Section 2.7: “H₂O₂/min/mg protein” should be written as “H₂O₂/min/mg protein” 9. Section 2.7: The full form of “LV” should be written before using the abbreviation 10. Section 2.9: Font size of the section should be adjusted in line with rest of the manuscript 11. Figure 1: In figure legend “H₂O₂” should be written as “H₂O₂” 12. Section 3.3: “TBars” should be written as “TBARS” 13. Figure 3: In the figure legend ELISA is mentioned. However, it is not evidently described in the “Material and Methods” section 2.8. 14. In the “Discussion” section, full form of “LBI” should be written before the abbreviation. 15. Conclusion: “PBM can protect cells” should be written as “PBM plays a protective role” 16. Conclusion. A last line may be added highlighting the need of further in vivo studies to validate the findings of this study and to decipher the mechanism of action of PBMT | |

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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Amit Talukdar</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>College of Veterinary Science, Assam Agricultural University, India</p> |