



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_24535
Title of the Manuscript:	Profile of snakebite accidents in the state of Rio de Janeiro from 2001 to 2012: an epidemiological study
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Authors observe in lines 68 and 69 that notified. However, there were differences in the total number of cases when some categories were analyzed separately, the reason may be double entry at separate health systems or something else, need to be clear. Low death rate need to be probed as this may be referral before death or some other reason. What are the reasons for early care of snakebite cases need to be documented The high survival rate after treatment needs attention if it is due to better protocol of treatment or better antsnake venom, the treatment protocol needs to be explained and also if the antivenom includes all the identified species need to be discussed. The lines 149& 150, the authors say; Another important point found in the present study is that large amounts of data that should have been registered in the notification records input to SINAN were in fact never recorded. So what appear to be the reasons for non recording or the deaths were not recorded ?	First of all, we would like to thank you for your considerations. Detailed responses were added to manuscript and highlighted. We believe that specificities of Brazilian care for this type of health issue, with early referral to specific sites of treatment, and notification, that must be made for the professional responsible for the first care, contribute not only to the good outcome observed but also to the great amount of lack of data, since the denouement of cases and specific characteristics of each type of accident are unknown to those professionals. Regarding the low death rate, the high number of cases in which the disclosure was marked as “unknown”, associated to the possibility of underreporting, undermines the analysis, as highlighted in the original manuscript. However, the possibility of specialized care and the availability of antivenoms that are active against the two main genera of snakes involved in accidents in the state and against the two genera that produce similar symptoms favour the existence of a true good survival rate.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		