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Reviewer's report:

The referee would not agree to publish of this manuscript in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine as an original paper because some of reasons, there are….

This manuscript doesn't find out novelty. Because this manuscript is similar to a reference which title is Curcumin exerts antitumor effects in retinoblastoma cells by regulating the JNK and p38 MAPK pathways.

1. Please raise the resolution all figure. Please make the title of axis more visible. In Figure 2A, is comment of X-axis correct? The referee think it is not incubation time but Quercetin.

2. As Figure 2B, the author should add the results of 0 μM of quercetin. If not, the author cannot analyze as correct data. In figure 2B and 2C, 4A and 4B, 5A and 5B, why are they displayed different concentration of quercetin each other? (ex. 0, 50, 100 or 25, 75, 100.)

3. As Figure 6A and 6B, are they correct to show the results of Western blotting graphically? The referee think it is not match between image of Western blot and graph, especially Figure 6B. (As for, Quercetin ++)

4. L.118, RAPMI : please correct RPMI

5. L.138, 138, g/mL : Is it correct? or μg/mL??
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

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:
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