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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript authors have studied effect of ginseng-related monomers or mixtures on a cancer cachexia mouse model. Although study has some merits, there are many concerns. Following are my comments:

1. In general cell line procurement from cell bank is preferred. How did authors authenticated C26 colon adenocarcinoma cells.

2. Ginseng extract and isolates from it have been reported for anticancer and immune-enhancing effects, in such case results of this study are obvious. How would author define novelty of this study? Add in introduction.

3. Further, it is known that Ginsenoside Rb1 attenuate Cytokines TNF-α and IL-6. Thus is it expected that it will reduce their levels in cancer cachexia mouse model also. In such case how much significant is this study.

4. In general, for more then one groups, ANOVA is applied which is followed by post hoc test. In this study t-test was performed which is used for comparing 2 groups. Authors should apply proper statistical tests for comparison.

5. All graphs are showing one side of deviation, in my opinion it is not proper. SD values in the graphs should represent both + and - side.

6. Author should discuss relation between cytokines levels and cachexia.

7. It is not clear from the results if treatment is curing cancer thus resulting in reduction of cytokine levels or treatment is attenuating cytokine levels and thus improving cancer cachexia.

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:
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