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Author's response to reviews: see over
ANSWERS TO REVIEWER HENRIK VON EULER

General

1) The statement “… the mechanism of action is poorly understood” was changed by “it has not yet been universally accepted”.
2) The suggestion made by the reviewer “… their motivation for this research more clearly and relate the importance of their results to a practical application” was taken into account and added.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1)
- The experiment was approved by the ethical committee of Oriente University, which follows the guidelines from the Cuban animal ethical committee. This was added to manuscript (see animals topic in Methods)
- The death of one animal 1 day posttreatment was detailed in the manuscript (see P 6 in Results) and explained (see P 8 in Discussion)
- The comments related to the use of anaesthesia and the state of animals during DEC treatment were answered (see in Methods animals topic and P 6 in electrochemical treatment). The effects of fixation on mice were added (see P 9 in Discussion)

2) The English was carefully revised by an expert.

3) “Olsson 2002” correspond to “Von Euler, 2002 [11]”. References no.3 and no.4 were removed and changed by new references. Reference no.10 was added.

4) Reference no. 6 (Bergues LC 2002) was removed. Reference no. 14 was not removed.

5) The comment was taken into account and answered in the manuscript (see P 3 in electrochemical treatment topic). The results and explanation of this fact were exposed in P 6 and P 7 of Result and Discussion, respectively.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) The comment of reviewer was taken into account and corrected in the respective figures and tables. Slight changes were made. In P 4 (of electrochemical treatment topic in Methods) was added the information of these figures and tables.

Some details of each experiment were included in the manuscript. The aim was especificate
ANSWERS TO REVIEWER YONA KEISARI

Major Compulsory Revisions
a) The comments were taken into account and the probabilities were specified and added to the results.

b) We agree with the reviewer. Immunohistochemistry reveals ultrastructural details that contribute to the knowledge of DEC action mechanism. However, we believe that for the proposed aim in this study (see background) histochemistry is enough. We also believe that the current researchs should be mainly addressed to dilucidate the goal of dose and electrode array. This will allow:
1) To establish a therapeutic procedure for tumor treatment animals and in clinic oncology.
2) To maximize the tumor destruction and to minimize the adverse effects induced in the organism. Once reached this optimizing condition thus we would proceed to use immunohistochemistry.

Minor Essential Revisions
a) References #3 and #4 were changed. Reference #6 was removed. Reference #10 was added.

b) In reference #6, the suggestion of the reviewer was taken into account (actually is #6)

c) This explanation was given in the manuscript (see P 3 in electrochemical treatment topic). The results and explanation of this fact were exposed in P 6 and P 7 of Result and Discussion, respectively.

Some details of each experiment were included in the manuscript. The aim was especificate