



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_20709
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Carboplatin and Methotrexate on Lipid Levels in the Plasma Membrane of MCF-7 Cells and their Association with Cell Motility
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 (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	Please check and correct carefully the language used in the manuscript. The Reviewer can find many grammatical errors. The Abstract MUST be re-written, in current version is very erratic and incoherent. Line88-99 are presented common knowledge, and in Reviewer's opinion could be removed from text. Line 117-118; there is not enough evidences presented in previous text to confirm this statement. Please explain the usage of MCF7 cell line in the experiment. Please explain the concentration of MTX and CPT used in the experiment. Are they based on previous experiments or on literature data? Please change the legend of Fig.3 and Fig. 4. Cells were not cultured under optimal conditions with drugs (medium without FBS) – experimental conditions sounds better. Please add to the graphs names of the drugs. Why Fig3 represents means of 3 determinations and Fig. 4 not? Line 338-343 with such theses the idea of making experiments presented in the paper is failing! Please re-think this part!	1. First I would like to thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and writing your comments. 2. Abstract is re-written according to authors' guidelines. 3. Lines 88 to 85 have been removed but 96 till 99 were left to introduce the important role that phospholipids play. 4. Reference added to first sentence (in line 117) and as for the second sentence it introduce the aim of the present work. 5. We used MCF-7 due to their availability in our collaborator's lab who work on breast cancer. 6. The mtx and cpt concentrations used were based on our MTT assays to determine the concentration of the drug that leads to 50% cell death. Concentration of these two drugs from literature were different than ours. 7. Legend of fig 3 and 4 were changed as per reviewer requested. 8. Fig. 4 is also means of 3 determination. Legend re-clarified. 9. Names of graph has been added



SDI Review Form 1.6

		10. Concerning Lines 338-343, we are giving different suggestions to explain the results obtained in our MTT assay. The effect of both drugs was first studied in the presence of FBS but no effect was seen with both drugs. Effect of both drugs on cells was seen when FBS was removed from media. As for the other suggestions, they are legitimate ones that were proposed as well by other researchers.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 8: breast cancer cell MCF7 ; in the Reviewer's opinion the Authors should use term "breast cancer cell line MCF7" or "MCF7 breast cancer cells" line19: The plasma lipid content of MCF7 were extracted ☐(..) is incorrect; There is a lack of reference to Fig. 1 in the text. Remove dots from figures legends. Line 109-110, please give the examples of tumors. Line 116: PC, PI, PE and PS ☐- please put the full names by the abbrevaitioans. Please use uniform variants of the drugs' names (used in experiment) writing. Please explain why starvation effect (no FBS in experimental medium) was combined with drug addition. IC50- please, give the full name by the abbreviation. Please add the information about the number of experiments repetition. Please put the name of HPLC instrument used in the experiment. Line 226: "The same was true for Methotrexate." This sentence must be changed. ☐ Please add statistical significance to all Figs and Tables	1. Comment taken into consideration. 2. Comment taken into consideration. 3. No reference was added as structure of drugs can be obtained from many different sources. Structure was taken from sigma specification sheet. 4. Dots have been removed from table legends. 5. Additional references were added for more examples. 6. Names of abbreviations were added 7. All names of drugs were written uniformly 8. To determine IC50, cells were treated with media containing fetal bovine serum (FBS) in the presence of the drug. However, no effect of the drugs on MCF-7 was seen in presence of FBS. Upon omitting FBS, cells died in the presence of drugs. 9. All experiments were repeated 3 times. 10. Name of HPLC instrument added in material and method section. 11. Sentence in line 226 has been corrected. 12. Statistical significance are added where applicable.
---------------------------------------	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with comparing results. Please place the Table 2 legend above the table. Fig. 8 Legend: Lack of the number of repetitions of the experiment.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Abstract construction is not following the guideline for Authors. Keywords are missing. Please check the format of References. The results obtained on in vitro experiments with single cell line should not be used to make general statements about breast cancer and drugs effects.	Abstract has been re-written following authors' guidelines. Key words were added.