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Reviewer’s report:

The study is well written but the manuscript makes no sense without a complete report on the Results. Only 5 lines in this section is not understandable. Also, in the Results section of the Abstract, the findings are not understood.

Materials & Methods: Evaluation of response is not clear: “results were not matched until the study was completed”.

There is no major objection to the laboratory research, but it also requires more detailed information of the lab results.

Discussion: 2nd paragraph: the third line: “in hamster cell lines and in ovarian cancer cell” is reversed in order.
Next line, and in many instances, they use commas instead of periods, in the numbers.

Check the grammer. Especially the use of “ on the other hand” in many cases, and the use of “ab initio” is too numerous.

One of my main concerns is the evaluation of response, and how the patients were deemed as responders or non-responders, by CT, etc?

Provide accurate and complete information in the Figure Legends.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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