

Reviewer's report

Title: Lipodox® (generic doxorubicin hydrochloride liposome injection): in vivo efficacy and bioequivalence versus Caelyx® (doxorubicin hydrochloride liposome injection) in human mammary carcinoma (MX-1) xenograft and syngeneic fibrosarcoma (WEHI 164) mouse models

Version: 0 **Date:** 17 Jan 2017

Reviewer: Deep Kamal Karelia

Reviewer's report:

The manuscript entitled "Lipodox® (generic doxorubicin hydrochloride liposome injection): in vivo efficacy and bioequivalence versus Caelyx® (doxorubicin hydrochloride liposome injection) in human mammary carcinoma xenograft and syngeneic fibrosarcoma mouse models" by Drs. Burade et al, compares the preclinical anti-tumor efficacy, safety and plasma PK profile of Lipodox® (SPIL's DXR HCL liposome) injection, with reference Caelyx® (DXR HCL liposome) injection, in two different mouse models (MX-1 xenograft mice and syngeneic fibrosarcoma-bearing mice). The manuscript is well written and provides in detailed efficacy, toxicity and plasma PK profile of Lipodox®. All experiments have been performed using proper controls and a thorough analysis of the results have been presented. The following needs authors clarification or editing:

1. Figure 1a: Error bars are missing or cannot be visualized.
2. Authors need to provide an explanation regarding different number of animals used in figure 1a between SPIL DXR HCL treated group (n=11) vs Reference DXR HCL (n=15)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal