

**ReviewForm3**

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:           | <a href="#">Archives of Current ResearchInternational</a>   |
| ManuscriptNumber:       | Ms_ACRI_123476  |
| Title ofthe Manuscript: | Chemoprotectiveeffect of eugenolon repeated dose doxorubicin,induced genotoxic lesions in mouse bone marrow |
| Type ofthe Article      |   |

**PART1:Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | Reviewer's comment  | Author's Feedback(Please correctthe manuscriptand highlightthatpart inthe manuscript.Itismandatory thatauthors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community.Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript?A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part                         | What draws our attention is the fact that bone marrow toxicity is a complication of almost all chemotherapeutic agents and the fact that an agent that can minimize these effects has been found is a great contribution to science in this sense since, to date, despite advances in pharmacology and oncotherapeutictreatments, we still cannot have the old treatments available since they continue to be used in polychemotherapy.   |  |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | The title reflects well what Eugenol was able to do   |  |
| 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.   | It seemed to me to summarize very well in an understandable way   |  |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | Yes, they are satisfactory.   |  |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript.Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The justification is for a preclinical study in animals undergoing chemotherapy (dogs and cats).<br><br>They mentioned the equivalence of the dose of doxa received by dogs to mice, which makes the study quite interesting<br><br>"According to previous studies, the most commonly used dosage of doxorubicin is 60–75 mg/m <sup>2</sup> intravenously for two cycles in dogs, which is equivalent to 20–25 mg/kg of body weight in mice"  |  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.<br>-  | The question of the benefits of eugenol needs to be weighed against the risks of eugenol.<br>This needs to be mentioned in the discussion since, at the dose and times administered, eugenol was not toxic to the animals. However, we know that the great challenge of applying eugenol to clinical work is precisely this dose, since eugenol can be genotoxic.<br><br>We suggest that this aspect be discussed.<br><br>There are several references for this purpose, such as Pharmacological and Toxicological Properties of Eugenol, available at <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7227856/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7227856/</a> and published in 2024<br><br>"Pharmacodynamic, pharmacokinetic, toxicity and recent advances in Eugenol's potential benefits against natural and chemical noxious agents: A mechanistic review <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0041010124000138">https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0041010124000138</a> |  |

**ReviewForm3**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments   | One or another correction must be made |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  |  |
| Optional/General comments   |  |  |

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Conceição Aparecida Dornelas</b> |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Brasil</b>                       |