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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

The authors have satisfactorily addressed most of my concerns. However, although the English usage in the revised version is improved, there are still serious problems, especially in the Background and Discussion sections. “English Manager Science Editing” is not enough. The authors should identify someone with a good command of written English who can help them.

Specific Comments

Abstract
1. The purpose of the study should be stated at the beginning of the abstract.
2. It should be indicated with what the cells were irradiated with and where, not just “a reactor.”

Background
3. BNCT was not “rediscovered” in recent years, and it was not “owing to the development of boron-carrying agents.”
4. p. 6. Not “absorbed” doses, but “irradiated with neutron doses of …”
5. The Discussion has been significantly improved, but there still are some problems with English usage and content. eg. P 15. p. This section of the Discussion should be condensed.
6. The “Conclusions” should be the concluding paragraph of the Discussion.

References
7. The authors should carefully review their references and replace outdated or tangentially relevant ones with more appropriate one.

Figures

Fig. 4 has high informational content, but is much too small. A and C should be separated out and presented as a separate figure. Where is B? D should be enlarged and made into a separate figure.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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