Gene, Cell and Tissue
Volume 10 · Issue 4 · e131147

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Anti-proliferative Effect of *Satureja sahandica* Extraction by Co-administration of Layered Double Hydroxide (LDH) Nanosheets on HepG2 Hepatocellular Carcinoma Cell Line

Hafez Abdol, Leila Taghipour, Saber Raeghi, Farzad Arjomandi Rad, Hossein Soltanzadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
12 Mar 2023	29 Apr 2023	1 May 2023	10.5812/gct-131147

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission Referee 1 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 5 Apr 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Apr 2023

In the submitted manuscript, “Anti-proliferative effects of Saturja sahandica extraction by co-administration of layered double hydroxide (LDH) nanosheets on HepG2 hepatocellular carcinoma cell line”, the authors provide some valuable scientific evidence regarding the anti-proliferative activity of Satureja sahandica extraction in combination with layered double hydroxide (LDH) nanosheets on the HepG2 HCC cell line. Overall, the paper needs modification according to the following comments:

- There is a lack of coherence in the introduction, and there is no continuity between the sentences.
- Satureja sahendica or Satureja sahandica - please become familiar with the literature.
- Keywords should be arranged alphabetically and selected from MeSH.
- Discussion: Lacks construction, focus, and impact.
- What are the research gaps not addressed in this study? What are the recommendations based on the results?

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

1. Gene names should be written in italic form.

Response: was performed.

2. Please report the statistical data to two/one decimal places (similar form).

Response: was performed.

3. Please discuss about the effect of LDH in discussion part.

Response: was performed.

4. The third paragraph of discussion needs more references and supporting data.

Response: was performed.

5. The effect of S. sahandica extraction on apoptotic percentage needs to be discussed in more detail.

Response: was performed.

Reviewer 2:

1. There is lack of coherence in the introduction and there is no continuity between the sentences.

Response: introduction was revised.

2. Satureja sahendica or Satureja sahandica - please become familiar with the literature.

Response: Satureja sahandica is correct.

3. Keywords arranged alphabetically and selected from the mesh.

Response: was performed.

4. Discussion: Lacks construction, focus, and impact.

Response: Discussion section was revised.

5. What are the research gaps not addressed in this study? What are the recommendations based on the results?

Response: was added end of Discussion section as limitations of the study.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.