



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_35293
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vivo Anti-Tumor Evaluation of Dihydroartemisinin-Derived Endodisulphide on MNU-Induced Liver Cancer in Sprague-Dawley Rats
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	The article has great merit, presents a theme of academic relevance and adequately explores the possible cancer treatment with Dihydroartemisinin-Derived. The abstract and introduction were well documented and understandable. However, I noted that the authors need to correct many shortcomings in the material and method and discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments	In line 33: Keywords: Might NOT contain words or phrases that are already in the title. Please change the keywords and also arrange them in alphabetical order Here, the section materials and methods, need to be seriously intended to. In line 97: the animals were male or female? please add for reproducibility and they were pathogen-free animals ?? In line 98: Please add the number of cage companions rats In line 105: A time-line diagram or flow chart may be useful to illustrate how complex study designs were carried out. In line 106: How it was the randomization done? In line 107: Explain how the number of animals was arrived at. Provide details of any sample size calculation used. In line 109: The animals were treated orally when (e.g. time of day). In line 111: For each group, give brief details of the groups including the experimental control groups (eg. Positive and negative control) In line 119: Why did you use rationale for choice of specific anaesthetic and what was the injected route used? In line 138: What is the concentration of the antibodies 1 and 2, add reproducibility of your work? In line 157: The data were submitted by some test of normality and homoscedasticity.	Keywords have been changed and arranged alphabetically as suggested Needed information has been added Needed information has been added Study design has been re-written and easy to understand. Animals were distributed into groups blindly, i.e., without any bias Sample size of n=5 is statistically reasonable for ANOVA analysis, which is statistical analysis intended for this study. But n=10 was decided with the consideration for possible loss of some animals before the end of the experiment. Dosing frequency and time of day has been added Ketamine/xylazine was chosen as it is standard anesthetic for rats. Drugs do not induce cancer or produce effects that could interfere with study. Route has been indicated. Concentrations of antibodies have been stated.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In line 189 section: Please add the number report absolute numbers (e.g. 10/20, not 50%) In line 200-section discussion. The result(s) has been well discussed. However, please add some comment on whether, and how, the findings of this study could be used in other species or systems, including any relevance to human biology.	Percentages were obtained from absolute numbers Comment has been included in manuscript
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		