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For more than 100 years, antivenoms have been produced by traditional methods of immunization of large mammals with mixtures of snake venoms (WHO, 2010; Gutiérrez et al., 2011). With the introduction of proteomic and transcriptomic tools in the molecular analysis of both venoms (venomics) (Calvete, 2014) and antivenoms (antivenomics) (Calvete, 2011, Calvete et al., 2014), in combination with the toxicological assessment of venoms, a more in-depth understanding of venom composition and antivenom efficacy is being built. As retrieved from current public databases on Elapidae, values for Median Lethal Dose (LD$_{50}$) are known for 203 toxins, belonging to seven protein sub-families, originating from 40 species (Fig. 1). Furthermore, the number of elapids for which venom-wide proteomics or transcriptomics studies have been reported has now reached 49 out of 355 described species (our unpublished data; http://www.reptile-database.org). Information is now available for a considerable number of species of high medical relevance.

Taken together, these insights, and new information being published, may provide the grounds for a knowledge-based design of future antivenoms, based on the identification of the toxicologically most relevant toxins in venoms. Scientific efforts have so far mainly been centered around molecular targeting of relevant snake toxins by using synthetic inhibitors (de Oliveira et al., 2003, Howes et al., 2007), nanobodies (Richard et al., 2013), or antibody fragments (Kulkeaw et al., 2009, Tamarozzi et al., 2006). However, a limitation for introducing novel antitoxins or inhibitors is that they usually only target one or few individual toxins, and not the whole venom, which typically contains many toxins belonging to various protein families (Calvete, 2011). For many snake venoms, this challenge could be overcome if a complete overview of the effect of each toxin in the venom were at hand; this would allow a distinction between toxins that are essential to neutralize in envenoming cases, and toxins/proteins that are not pathophysiologically important. This could in the future enable researchers to develop antitoxins against the medically relevant toxins and use mixtures of these antitoxins as a replacement, or reinforcement, of antivenoms (Roncolato et al., 2013), potentially providing better efficacy and safety, and lower cost of treatment. We argue that despite the wealth of efforts within characterization of snake venoms, a lack of a systematic approach for evaluating the importance of individual toxins within whole venom still exists. Furthermore, no simple tool has been presented for evaluating whether a given toxin in a snake venom is of sufficient medical relevance to justify an antitoxin discovery program against it. Without such a tool, modern
antivenom research based on molecular biology, medicinal chemistry, and biotechnology risks becoming unfocused in the jungle of snake venom and antivenom data.

Primarily two properties of toxins are relevant when evaluating their potential medical impact: 1) Intrinsic toxicity, and 2) abundance in venom. A systematic method for evaluating the relevance for acute toxicity, i.e. lethality, of each toxin in whole venom, taking both toxicity and abundance into account, was recently presented (Laustsen et al., 2015a). This method is based on a Toxicity Score, which is calculated for either a toxin or whole venom itself by dividing the relative toxin abundance in the venom (in percentage) by the LD50 value for the toxin in mice. If the confidence intervals are known for both the abundance and LD50, a confidence interval for the Toxicity Score can be easily calculated. This parameter was initially proposed for ranking the medical importance of toxins in the venom of the black mamba, Dendroaspis polylepis (Laustsen et al., 2015a). Further studies on Naja kaouthia and Aipysurus laevis venoms strongly suggest that Toxicity Score is likely to be a better parameter to determine the medical relevance of a toxin than LD50 estimation alone, and may be used for assessing the relative importance of toxins in whole venom (Laustsen et al., 2015b, Laustsen et al., 2015c). The Toxicity Score can be used to quickly assess whether, for example, a toxin of high abundance and moderate toxicity is of higher importance than a very potent toxin of low abundance. This approach provides an easy, systematic method for identifying the key toxins that antivenom development should focus on. Table 1 presents an example of estimation of the Toxicity Score.

When the Toxicity Score is used to select the relevant toxins, which should be neutralized by an antivenom or an inhibitor, a decision has to be made to define a threshold value for relevance. For snakes that are able to inject large amounts of venom into their prey or predators, even toxins with a low Toxicity Score may become important. Therefore, the minimum cut-off value for the Toxicity Score has to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and has to take into account the total amount of venom that the specific snake is able to inject in a bite. Table 2 illustrates an example on how to determine the relevant toxins in a venom on the basis of a cut-off value for the Toxicity Score of 5. Using reported venom yields from milking of snakes (e.g. the values reported on http://snakedatabase.org/pages/LD50.php) provides a basis for the worst-case upper limit of venom that may be injected in a bite from different snake species. For example, from our previous work on
the venom of *Naja kaouthia* (Laustsen et al., 2015b), reported in this database to deliver up to 742 mg of venom, a cut-off value of the Toxicity Score of 5 would select a group of 5 neurotoxins of the three-finger toxin family and one PLA₂ among a total of 28 fractions as the most relevant targets to neutralize. Fractions with a Toxicity Score below this value would have less than 37 LD₅₀s for an envenomation with the maximum yield of 742 mg, and are thus likely not to play a significant role in overall venom toxicity.

The issue of potential synergism between venom components has to be taken into consideration when selecting key toxins to focus antivenom development efforts on. Using the Toxicity Score allows for the identification of venoms where toxins display synergistic effects. As shown in the cases of *D. polylepis* (Laustsen et al., 2015a) and *A. laevis* (Laustsen et al., 2015c) venoms, the Toxicity Score of the whole venom is higher than the sum of Toxicity Scores of individual toxins, thus indicating the presence of synergism. In these cases it is relevant to further investigate the synergistic effects by assessing the toxicities of pairs of toxins in order to identify proteins of low Toxicity Score, but which exert synergistic effects. An example of such an approach is given by Strydom (1976) for toxins from *D. polylepis* venom. Despite their low intrinsic toxicity, synergistically acting toxins would also be good candidates to include in an antivenom development program.

The Toxicity Score can be readily applied to the study of elapid snake venoms because: (a) the main toxic activity of these venoms is neuromuscular paralysis leading to respiratory arrest and death, thus making the assessment of lethality a clinically-relevant parameter; (b) the solvents used in many separation methods (such as the commonly used reverse-phase HPLC) do not generally denature the most relevant elapid venom toxins, such as three-finger toxins, dendrotoxins, and phospholipases A₂ (PLA₂) (Fry et al., 2015); and (c) the mouse model used in the determination of LD₅₀ is generally relevant to the human situation, as the physiological mechanisms involved in neuromuscular transmission in mice and humans are similar.

The use of this parameter in viperid snake venoms might be more complicated, for the following reasons: (a) Although lethality is the most serious complication of viperid envenomings, other aspects also have high medical relevance, such as local tissue damage, i.e. necrosis and hemorrhage, and systemic effects such as coagulopathy and systemic hemorrhage (Warrell, 2010). (b) The solvents used in reverse phase-HPLC, especially acetonitrile, denature relevant toxins in viperid
venoms, particularly zinc-dependent metalloproteinases (SVMPs), thus affecting their toxicity. It is likely, nevertheless, that these two hurdles might be overcome in the future, with the development of non-denaturing separation methods of high resolution. At present, using the Toxicity Score is therefore only feasible for focusing development efforts on elapid antivenoms, where the toxins do not lose activity in the purification process. An exception is the case of some Australian elapid venoms containing potent procoagulant serine proteinases playing a significant role in toxicity (Kini, 2005), which could be affected by chromatographic solvents; however, the key toxins in the vast majority of elapid venoms can withstand solvents used in reverse-phase HPLC.

The Toxicity Score has been employed for directing drug discovery efforts against α-cobratoxin, which was shown to have the highest relevance in Naja kaouthia venom (Laustsen et al., 2015b), using phage display screening (Laustsen et al., 2015d). In this example, the Toxicity Score predicts that blocking the action of α-cobratoxin will abrogate the overall toxicity of the venom. In conclusion, when working with elapid venoms, using the Toxicity Score may thus provide a clearer path for determining the medical importance of different toxins in whole venom for the development of toxin inhibitors and the improvement of antivenoms.
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Table 1: Example of how Toxicity Scores are calculated for three toxins and whole venom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
<th>LD₅₀ (mg/kg)</th>
<th>Toxicity Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toxin 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole venom</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Toxicity Score = \( \frac{\text{Abundance} \, (\%)}{\text{LD}_{50}} \)
Table 2: Example of how Toxicity Scores may help distinguish between medically relevant and non-relevant toxins/proteins, when selecting targets for focused antivenom development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abundance (%)</th>
<th>LD50 (mg/kg)</th>
<th>Toxicity Score</th>
<th>Medically relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole venom</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure legend

Figure 1: Overview of numbers of elapid snake venom toxins for which toxicity, as judged by estimation of Median Lethal Dose (LD₅₀), has been assessed. Snake genera are highlighted in A by color codes.