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Reviewer's report:

I don't agree with the title, do not reflect the works content, it is not a therapeutic alternative, because its just in vitro studies, there is an early stage of preclinical studies. Could be: non steroidal analogues of 2methoxy oestradiol with in vitro antineoplastic activity in neurofibromatosis 2 and insight into the mechanism of action.

In the abstract avoid vulgar comments like: potter group or barald group because they are coauthors, then use we.....

Page 1 line 51-52, what is (age 38)
Page 2 line 32-33 avoid by potter group.
Page 3 methods

Don't use antibiotic to measure drug responses its is a very big mistake.

Line 53, indicate the final % of DMSO in culture. Indicate time of exposition to the drug, explain why use repeated doses of drug?

Please define briefly the types of cell used, like if is a normal phenotype or is cell derived from a pathological tissue.

Major concern

The result presentation are totally hard of analyze, please calculate the ic50 in all of the cases. Use normalized parameter in the graph axis.

Analyze the selectivity using selectivity index, tabulate the results.

Use color codes to avoid the repetition of the compounds names.

Reports the ic50 for the first 48 hours, that are the relevant exposition times.

General comments, avoid the terminologies low concentration, etc using the actual number, like the ic50 for example.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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