



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_18952
Title of the Manuscript:	mAb Higher Order Structure Analysis with Protein Conformational Array ELISA
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript describes an analysis of IgG1 and IgG2 surface epitope changes in response to the various condition changes using protein conformation array-based ELISA. The following issues need to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were mAbs IgG1 and IgG2 analyzed in the study human or mouse? Please define these mAbs clearly in the introduction. 2. Which kind of antibody class did authors use as antigen to develop pAbs for PCA ELISA? Although the information may be available in the reference that the authors cited, it would be helpful to the readers if the authors could introduce a little bit background about 30 pAbs. 3. Why did the authors choose one IgG2 subclass for analysis of the effect of one condition change on the antibody HOS change, not one subclass versus all condition changes? 4. How did author determine there was a significant difference in HOS between two groups based on PCA ELISA readings? 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Basically, ELISA is qualitative, or semi-quantitative, but not fully quantitative. Therefore, personally I do not think there was any significant difference across the whole panel between two groups shown in Figure 4.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. What were the concentrations of sample mAbs, when these were treated under different conditions?6. How did authors come to a conclusion of unfolding of a small mab population around 1% based on fig.3 at line 196?7. The introduction section is too long. It should be shortened substantially.8. A reference should be given for the sentence between lines from 131 to 34/ page 2 and as well for the sentence between lines from 196 to 197/page 12.9. The manuscript suffers from a large number of errors including grammatical, editorial, and formatting errors. The manuscript should be re-read carefully and checked for all errors and reworded for some phrases. Here are just some examples:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “their Higher Order Structure” at line 5/page 1 should be plural and “s” should be	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>added to the “structure”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Abbreviations should be used for “Protein Conformation Array” at lines 13/page 1 and 246/page 16, “monoclonal antibodies” at line 15/page 1, and “Higher Order Structure” at line 50/page 3.• “epitope distribution” at line 8/page 1 should be “epitope change”.• “A novel technology to follow changes” at line 6/ page 1 should be “A novel technology to monitor changes”.• “mAbs”, “HOS” at line 17/page 1 should be deleted.• “biologics” at lines 20/page 1, line 28/page 2 should be “biologic”.• Abbreviations were not spelled out the first time they were mentioned in the main body of the text, such as PCA at line 40/page 2, EMA at line 73/page 4.• “process” at line 42/page 2 should be “the process”.• “protein target” at line 54/page 3 should be “mAb”.• “species” at line 59/page 3 should be “copies”.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “the peptides” at line 105/page 5 should be “the antibody peptides”.• “derived antibody” at line 115/page 6 should be “derived antibodies”.• “vies versa” at line 115/page 6 should be “vice versa”.• “treatment” at line 129/page 6 should be “treatments”.• “row B to G” at lines 108/page 5 and 127/page 6 should be “rows B to G”.• “In contrast the” at line 176/page 10 should be “In contrast, the”.• “The result suggested” at line 196/page 12” should be “The result suggests”.• “There was also additional epitope” at line 216/page 13 should be “There was also an additional epitope”.• “a control” at line 224/page14 should be “its control”.• “indicated” at line 226/page 14 should be “indicates”• “Protein conformational array (PCA)” at line 251/page 16 should be ‘PCA”.• “it is” at line 267/page 17 should be “it	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>was”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “HOS profile” at line 269 /page 17 should be “HOS profiles”. • “open of this area” at line 281/page 17 should be “opening of this area”. • “suggested” at line 297 /page 18 should be “suggests”. • “since there is no across the panel increase of epitops exposure in this test” at lines 296-297/page 18 should be “since there is no increase of epitope exposure across the panel in this test”. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Canada