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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Amiodarone toxicity is a well-known entity, but its treatment and precautions are still unknown. The question is not new, but the answer is not yet known. The question is well-defined. The answer given in the study is new since it proposes new modalities for prevention which seems clinically applicable.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The methods are defined in details, considering the agents and their doses administered, the procedures performed and the tests made for viability analysis. Methods are appropriate for analysis (MTT is a standard test for viability analysis, and there is consensus on it for cytotoxicity). All technical details were given. There is sufficient data provided to replicate the work.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The data are well controlled. The experiments were repeated 6 times and seem sufficient for reliable data. The viability test performed is a very-well defined Standard test employed for long years and proven its reproducibility for repeated times in several studies.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

The data given, material and methods employed, and the results seem reliable. The results given can be considered new and is reproducible for the literature. Manuscript is well written, the question asked could be answered, and the clinical message is derived from the cell-culture study. Manuscript adheres to standards mentioned.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The manuscript searches for an answer not readily well-known. The results are supported by sufficient data adequately. The discussion and conclusions are well balanced emphasizing the results of their origin of hypothesis.
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title and abstract are short, but enough for what has been told.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your
comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious
deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following
categories:
• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a
decision on publication can be reached)
• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use
of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but
which the author can choose to ignore)

Once you have done this, there are also some questions for you to answer,
including one that asks your advice on publication.

When you have completed your report, please upload it using the online form,
accessible using the 'submit your report' tab above.

Confirmation of your acceptance to review, with links to the manuscript files and
upload form, will also be emailed to you at ivargel@gmail.com.
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