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Is there any reason why the route of administration of gemcitabine was subcutaneous injection instead of intravenous injection?
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Since 2013, nab-paclitaxel in combination with gemcitabine has been approved in many countries as a first-line treatment for patients with metastatic adenocarcinoma of the pancreas. The safety and efficacy of the combination of nab-paclitaxel followed by gemcitabine therapy has been established. Please described the advantage of Orthosiphon stamineum over nab-paclitaxel in discussion section.<br> In previous reports, Orthosiphon stamineum monotherapy was effective against HCT116 xenograft tumors (Reference #9, J Biochem Tech (2012) 3(5): S170-176). However, in this report using Panc-1 xenograft models, no anticancer effect was observed with Orthosiphon stamineum monotherapy. The authors should investigate why Orthosiphon stamineum monotherapy was not effective against Panc-1 xenograft tumors.<br> Discussion is too long with a lot of textbook knowledge and can be made shorter.<br>
RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 74749

Title: Anti-tumour activity and toxicological studies of combination treatment of Orthosiphon stamineus and gemcitabine on pancreatic xenograft model

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05330707

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Japan

Author’s Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-28 21:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-30 00:15

Review time: 1 Day and 2 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>Grade C: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>Grade D: Fair</td>
<td>Grade E: Do not publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracted text</th>
<th>Grade A: Priority publishing</th>
<th>Grade B: Minor language polishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>Grade D: Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Accept (High priority)</th>
<th>Accept (General priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-reviewer</th>
<th>Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous</th>
<th>[ ] Onymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All my comments have been addressed. No further comments.