

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77806
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF ANTI PROLIFERATIVE POTENTIAL OF SOLANUM VIRGINIANUM HUMAN HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA CELL LINE
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The title needs to be changed in: EVALUATION OF ANTI PROLIFERATIVE POTENTIAL OF SOLANUM VIRGINIANUM on a HUMAN HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA CELL LINE</p> <p>English language needs to be thoroughly improved. The mistakes are all over the manuscript and they are too many to be listed here.</p> <p>In the Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“Anti proliferation” has to be “anti-proliferative”. -It is not necessary to give too specific technical information. -If the Authors choose to give concentrations in µM, please do not give results in µg/ml. -In the sentence “From the results, the extracts were cytotoxic to the hepG2 cells at (60µg/ml) concentration and incubation period”, it is not clear what “incubation period” means. How long ids the effective incubation period? <p>“MATERIAL AND METHOD” should be “ MATERIAL AND METHODS”</p> <p>PREPARATION OF THE HERBAL EXTRACT: How is the SOLANUM VIRGINIANUM sterilized, before treating cell cultures? What is the final solvent used to solubilize the SOLANUM VIRGINIANUM? Does aqueous solution mean water? (if water is used to solubilize the SOLANUM VIRGINIANUM, please note that water could induce osmotic lysis in cells).</p> <p>CELL CULTURE REAGENTS: What does “Trypsin-EDTA versus glucose solution” mean? It is not necessary to describe how to passage the cells, since it is a routine methodology. Similarly, it is not necessary to describe how to use the Neubauer haemocytometer.</p> <p>PROCEDURE The sentence “ HepG2 cells were placed in 24 well plates at a concentration of 5 x 10⁴ cells/well 24 hours after plating” is incorrect. “cells were treated with ION...”: what does ION mean? The sections “Cell proliferation assay” and “Procedure” should be merged in a single section.</p> <p>STATISTICAL ANALYSIS: “represented as mean±SD for six animals in each group” is clearly wrong, since there are no animals on the study.</p> <p>Legend Figure 2: “Evaluation of anticancer activity” is incorrect. It should be “anti-proliferative activity”.</p> <p>Legend of Figure 2 should describe the histogram. If the histograms suggests that the IC50 is 60 ug/ml, this has to be indicated in the main section of manuscript.</p> <p>The legend of Figure 2 holds that “At a concentration of 60µg/ml, the percentage of the cell viability is 50%” but this concentration has NOT been tested (it is not reported in the histogram).</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>In the sentence “* represents statistical significance between control versus treatment group was $p < 0.04$ at $60\mu\text{g/ml}$, with $p < 0.05$ level using Student's - Newman-Keuls test, statistically significant” (Legend of Figure 2), punctuation is wrong and the meaning of the sentence is obscure.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION This section is only a discussion. It lacks a systematic description of the results. Results need to be precisely described in the RESULTS section. The RESULTS section has also to refer to the respective Figures. Concentrations used have to be given in this section, and they have to be uniformed with the concentration units used in other parts of the manuscript. Reference numbers must be placed exactly where the reference is cited, not at the end of the section. In the discussion, comments on the use of other cancer cell lines is redundant.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS The sentence “this is the first study illustrating the anti-apoptotic effect” is incorrect, since the Authors demonstrate the anti-proliferative effect. The sentence “It showed effective anticancer activity” is incorrect, since they demonstrate only the anti-proliferative effect and not the anti-cancer effect, which is demonstrated by <i>in vivo</i> studies.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sabrina Battista
Department, University & Country	Istituto per l'Endocrinologia e l'Oncologia Sperimentale, Italy