

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Oncology Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_93366
Title of the Manuscript:	Ehrlich solid tumor induced injury and toxicity in liver and kidney in female mice
Type of the Article	Experimental

### **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:

(<https://www.journalsaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The manuscript has great social and scientific relevance. However, some adjustments need to be made. Here are the suggestions for adjustments:</b></p> <p><b>Background and Objective:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-In lines 3 and 4 it says that “the therapeutic efficacy of current drugs is minimal”. It is important to review this statement, since medicine has several methods, including therapeutic associations that allow excellent results in several patients. Perhaps it would be better to talk about the adverse effects of current treatments.</li> <li>- Do not use acronym without first having informed what it represents.</li> <li>-Rewrite the first two paragraphs better to synthesize the thought, as the information is verbose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-It is important that the introduction shows the relevance of the study. I suggest adding a paragraph at the end of the introduction with this information.</li> </ul> <p><b>Material and methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In sections 2.2 and 2.4 there is no information about the experiment time. How long were the animals sacrificed after tumor induction? The information is contained in the results, making the reader not understand the methodology until reaching the results.</li> <li>- In section 2.3 better describe the experimental groups. What we can understand from the experiment is that both groups 1 and 2 were composed of animals that had cancer cells inoculated subcutaneously (sedction 2.1) in the left thigh of each mouse. Thus, the following questions arise:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) group 1 is the control, as he also had cancer? Make it clear whether group 1 was healthy or had cancer implanted differently than group 2.</li> <li>b) if group 2 was treated, inform the type of treatment. What you can understand, after reading the results, is that group 1 was composed of animals with ascitic tumors and group 2 of solid tumors. These details need to be well described in the methodology.</li> </ul> </li> <li>-Does section 2.5 say that the serum activities of AST and ALT tansaminases as well as ALP levels were evaluated in another experiment (references 16&amp;17)?</li> <li>-Rewrite section 2.6.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The first line of the first paragraph says “The examination of untreated tumor-bearing mice”. How was group 2 treated? Better to use EST terms instead of “treated”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The second line of the third paragraph states that “EAC induced alterations in renal functions and damage to renal tissues”. Does this information refer to the results of the study performed or the study by Abd Eldaim et al? Make this clear, as the results show that there were no changes in the kidneys and liver of the animals in group 1. Check the results and adapt to the discussion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The study is relevant, but the methodology is not aligned with the results and discussion.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Welma Emidio Da Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brasil</b>