



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2015_IRJPAC_16772
Title of the Manuscript:	Antitumor activity of some metal complexes I. Cytotoxic activity of Bis(L-glutaminato) Tetrachloropalladate (II)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Text is ambiguous and lacks a considerable amount of information in the introduction, methodology and discussion. Rephrase is required too Chemical characterization by IR and AE is insufficient; UV, conductimetry and H-NMR are required for unequivocal characterization of structure and geometry of the complex and data must be provided. The ames test is not a cytotoxicity test but a mutagenicity test method; it's true that genotoxicity is closely related with cytotoxicity but the latter needs another type of assay to be studied. Ames test methodology is incomplete, Table 1 shows data with and without metabolic activation and there is no mention of that procedure in methodology section; additionally, it lacks the methodology to obtain microsomal fraction or S9 fraction in order to perform metabolic activation. In the other hand, strains must be previously tested in order to guarantee the genetic markers of bacteria (<i>His</i>-, violet cristal sensitivity (<i>rfa</i> mutation), presence of R plasmide (ampicilline resistance), U.V. light sensitivity (<i>uvrB</i> mutation). Results of TA100 strain was claimed as evidence of	This a Short Research Articles The samles were damaged, so we can not make a more analysis. As we said before, this is a short study and we will complete the study in the future. (The cytotoxic properties of the complex in mammalian cells are under study.)Page 3. The same answer of the previous comment.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	toxicity but the control in this strain shows no revertants, so maybe the bacteria actually did not grow by itself, and it's not evidence of toxicity but a failed test. To claim toxicity a dose-response curve must be found, results in TA98 strain show unequivocally the dose-response curve with the characteristic possitive slope followed of a negative slope, then we can declare a toxic effect for concentrations above 159.3 ug/mL according with results presented	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Bibliography is not homogeny, in some references title are provided and in some others the information lacks. Some references are pretty old.	Bibliography was corrected as homogeny and updated.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		