

Editor's Comment:

The Manuscript was assessed based on the reviewer's comments.

The manuscript had some improvements; however, the comments were not followed completely in the manuscript. For example:

1- The type of cancer (lung cancer cell line) was not mentioned either in the title, abstract, material and methods.

2- Formatting and typing errors. For example: lack of space between two sentences in line 44. In line 109 and 118 it should be 2ml NOT 2m1!

The figure legend of Fig 3: SW480 NOT Sw480!

In line 130: both drugs..... NOT both the drug.....

In line 140 and 141: possess NOT po sses

3- In the legend of Figure 1, does the author use exactly the same figure from chemspider or the author drew it based on the template.

4- In Figure 2, does the author copy the figure from a text or paper? The figure is also blurry.

5- In the line 76, the citation format is not similar to the other citations.

6- Several English errors should be corrected. For example:

-In line 94: and as well as DNA. The author should use as well as OR and NOT BOTH?!!

-In material and methods, the authors sometimes used present form of the verbs and some time past tens to explain the process. The process was done in the past so the processes should all follow the past tens.

-Line 112, 113, 114, and 115 there is a very long run on sentence, which should be broken down to several clear sentences.

-line 147, 148 and 154 are grammatically incorrect and thus not clear enough

- The first time using an abbreviation should have the complete name. For example: in line 136 complete names should be mentioned.

Figure 3 is still blurry and does not have clear resolution. The figure is poorly arranged and poorly labeled.

8- The reference formatting is not similar. For example:

-Line 158 Pp and other references use pp.

- In line 160 there are dots between abbreviated form of the name of journal while the other references do not have such a weird format.

-Reference 3 is very old. The author should use the most possible recent one.-- In reference 3: USA NOT U S A

-The format of page numbers is not similar among references. For example: In line 165 pp. 6016-6025 while in line 167: 1321-36!!!

Conclusion: The authors' corrections on reviewers' comments are disappointing. Thus the current form of the manuscript is not still qualified for publication unless the authors correct all the gaps as last chance.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Omid Iravani
Department of Anatomy, National University of Singapore,
Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, Singapore