



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_23992
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of monocarboxylate transporters and their chaperone CD147 in lactate efflux inhibition and the anticancer effects of Terminalia chebula in neuroblastoma cell line N2-A
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (<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>)
Compulsory REVISION comments	There are substantial editorial and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. It is essential for the authors to seek proofreading assistance/ service to enhance the readability of the manuscript.	
	Lines 27, 155 - 165, 284 - 291, 369 - 372 Given the expression of IG50, it is more appropriate for the authors to describe the study as a cell growth study rather than a cell proliferation study. Please revise throughout the manuscript.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Lines 32 - 34, 377 - 378 The authors should provide the basis of postulating “novel compounds/ novel targets” in TCE.</p>	
	<p>Lines 43 - 46 The importance of lactate efflux in the pathophysiology of cancer was poorly explained. Please revise.</p> <p>Also, it is unclear as to how on one hand intracellular acidosis could initiate early apoptosis, and on the other hand enhance cancer cell invasive etc. Please justify.</p>	
	<p>Lines 56 - 61 There is a lack of coherence in this paragraph. This is predominantly due to poor elaboration on the correlation between the use of natural product in cancer treatment and MCT. Please revise.</p>	
	<p>Lines 81 - 88 Plant Extraction: The authors should justify the basis of selecting ethanol as the main solvent for extraction.</p>	
	<p>Line 84 “The identified...” There should be a linking phrase indicating that it is a subsequent experiment. Please revise.</p>	
	<p>Lines 89 - 95 Cell Culture The authors should justify the basis of selecting N2-A and DI-TNC1 as the representative cell lines for cancer and normal cells, respectively.</p>	
	<p>Line 99 It is unclear as to why experimental media with reduced FBS was used. Please justify.</p>	
	<p>Line 100 It is unclear as to why 4 h was selected as the exposure time. Please justify.</p>	
	<p>Line 132 The description for MT3 is unclear. Please revise.</p>	
	<p>Line 151 The use of “previous study” in this context could be misleading to the reader. Please revise.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 167 – 169, 230 – 231 The expression of the number of independent studies and replicates was confusing. Please revise in accordance to the conventional way.</p>	
	<p>Line 182 and throughout manuscript. Please correct “IC50 >500<1000 ug/ml” as “500<IC50<100 ug/ml”. Please revise this throughout the manuscript and do likewise for all other related errors.</p>	
	<p>Lines 201 – 203 “4 ethanol...” Please revise the sentence in terms of the ranking of potency.</p>	
	<p>Lines 217 – 218 It is unclear as to where the results of CHC were indicated within the manuscript.</p>	
	<p>Figure 2: It is known that Log 0 is undefined as one can never get zero by raising anything to the power of anything else. The authors need to reexamine the dose response curve.</p>	
	<p>Figure 3 A, 5 and 6 B The images were of poor quality. Please enhance the quality of the images.</p>	
	<p>Line 382 It is unclear as to purpose of “uncategorised references” in this manuscript. Please justify.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Lines 21 – 22 “Among...” The statement appears to be a hanging sentence. Please revise.</p>	
	<p>Lines 24 – 25 “The plant extract...” The authors should include the IC50 of “the plant extract” for comparison with phloretin.</p>	
	<p>Lines 40 – 41 “... the cancer cell of...” “the cancer cell of” should be removed. Please revise.</p>	
	<p>Line 60 Please correct “consequents” to “consequential”.</p>	
	<p>Line 67 Please add “were” after “L-lactate assay kit”.</p>	
	<p>Lines 68 – 70 “Water-soluble...” The statement appears to be a hanging sentence. Please revise.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 78 The authors should use comas (,) instead of semi-colon (;).	
	Line 83 Please add “were” after “Plant-ethanol mixture”.	
	Line 87 Please correct “e thanol” as “ethanol”.	
	Line 98 Please correct “m” as “ml”.	
	Line 105 Please correct “FCE” as “TCE”.	
	Line 129 Please correct “rocker” as “rocking”.	
	Line 144 Please correct “each of” as “of each”.	
	Line 154 Please state the manufacturing country.	
	Lines 272 - 273 Please correct the spacing errors.	
	Line 352 Please correct “Sk-N-SH” as “SK-N-SH”.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia