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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript of Asgharpour et al. deals with the effects of propolis on oral streptococci and proliferation of cancer cell lines. The manuscript depicts some interesting results. However, the language is really not acceptable for publication. The manuscript needs extensive revision (native speaker) regarding the language. Additionally, the following major points should be addressed:

- The title should be changed: The authors tested the total propolis extract. I would recommend the following title "Iranian propolis efficiently inhibits growth of oral streptococci and cancer cell lines"

- Abstract: Add the aim of the study to the background. The biofilm formation was tested (not killing of already formed biofilm). This has to emphasized in the abstract. The conclusions section has to be rewritten. The authors just repeated the results. What is the clinical relevance of the results?

- Methods: how did the authors identified the streptococcal isolates: more details!

- A part of the used methods needs an Ethics approval (page 7, lines 19-23). The authors need a retrospectively approval of the Ethics Committee of their university

- Discussion: How can the difference of the effects on cancer cell line and fibroblasts be explained?

Minor points

- Page 9, line 10: Streptococcus mutans in italic.

- Throughout the manuscript: Streptococcus mutans and not Streptococcus mutants
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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