



rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>

FABAD A-602 Revision

2 messages

FABAD Ankara <fabadankara@gmail.com>
To: rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id

Thu, Apr 16, 2020 at 5:27 PM

Dear Retno WIDYOWATI,

Your manuscript (code: A-602) has been evaluated by the reviewers and the comments are given in the attached file. As you will see from the comments of the referees, your manuscript needs to be reevaluated. Attached please find the reviewer's comments for your submitted manuscript.

Kindly effect the recommended corrections and send it back within two weeks. The revised version of your manuscript will be sent to the same reviewers again, which means that a further evaluation of your contribution will be made. Final decision about acceptance or rejection is, therefore, still pending.

If the revised version is not submitted in time the manuscript will be withdrawn. Should you need additional time to prepare your review, please let us know.

The revised manuscript should follow the guideline listed below:

1. Response to the reviewers' comments should be on point by point basis and you should write your each answer just below the relevant comment of the reviewer in the word document I have mailed to you.
2. Also please indicate where changes have been made (with a different highlighted color in the text) in the revised manuscript.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi
FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Editor**Reviewer comments:****Reviewer 1.**

In this manuscript, briefly, the 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol extracts of *Orthosiphon stamineus* Benth. Was applied onto T47D cell line of human breast cancer and a "metabolite profiling" study for the extracts were performed through fingerprint chromatography to compare the ingredients in the extracts.

Even though the manuscript looks fine in the first impression there are some major



rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>

Fwd: proof of your manuscript

2 messages

FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 21, 2020 at 4:17 PM

To: rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id

----- Forwarded message -----

Gönderen: **FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences** <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Date: 17 Eyl 2020 Per, 14:42

Subject: proof of your manuscript

To: <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>

Dear **Retno WIDYOWATI**,

You can find the attached proof of your accepted manuscript entitled "**Anticancer Property of Orthosiphon stamineus Benth. Extracts in Different Solvent Systems against T47D Human Breast Cancer Cell Lines (Code: A-602)**" and acceptance letter for FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. Please check the proof and make your corrections on pdf file. We will be greatfull if you could send us corrected proof in 5 days. Please make your correction on pdf file. It is very important not to change anything in the content. If you do, you should be aware that your review would need to go under second evaluation.

P.S. Please check the format of your manuscript including references, key word numbers, titles (Turkish and English), ORCID IDs according to author's instructions. Unfited manuscripts will not be published.

If it is also related to your work, please send the ethical statements of your study via email.

Acceptance letter of your manuscript is also attached.

Thank you very much for your kind interest.

Sincerely Yours,
Nesrin Gökhan Kelekçi

2 attachments **A-602.pdf**
269K **A602-acceptance.pdf**
557K

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>
To: FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 22, 2020 at 9:06 AM

Dear editorial team,

Thank you very much for accepting our article. After checking, there were several typos in the script. They are:

1. Title: Benth is written in an upright form instead of italic
2. Summary: writing 50 on the IC50 using subscript form
3. The author's orcid ID of Retno Widyowati is wrong, the right one is <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0572-7551>
4. Introduction: the writing of compounds is a lack of comma.

orthosiphol D, orthosiphol E (Takeda *et.al*, 1993), orthosiphol A, orthosiphol B, 3'-hydroxy-5,6,7,4'-tetramethoxyflavone, neoorthosiphol A, neoorthosiphol B, α -amyrin, β -amyrin, maslinic acid, urosolic acid, orthosiphonone A, orthosiphonone B, myoinositol, β -caryophyllene, caffeic acid, sinensetin, tetra-methyl scutellarein, eupatorin, cirsimaritin, acetovanillochromene, orthochromene A, methylripario chromene, agermacrene-D, β -selinen α -cadinol, choline, betaine, O-cyamenea-terpineol, lyrol, valencene, nephtalin, camphor, α -elemene

There are our corrections and apologize if there are still some writing errors.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to be given to join your journal.

Best regards,

Retno Widyowati, PhD

[Quoted text hidden]

 **A-602-2 copy.pdf**
2381K

handicaps of the methodology applied in the current study. These are questioned below:

Major issues:

How authors decided to use 96%, 70% or 50% ethanol (EtOH, 3 x 10 minutes) using ultrasonic?

Why not 80% or 20%? Is there any discussion about this situation

How the analysis time effect the concentration of the ingredients? Is there any experiment?

With or without samples for cell line means control and treated group.. so how the dosage for the extracts were selected? Have them ever tried different amount of the extracts against cell! This part is not clear.. and if they have not tried.. it must be given a reason inside the text

Have the authors tried "only ethanol" against cell lines? How they have decided if the effect caused by the extract or ethanol itself?

They have compared the activity of extracts with Dox.. (Table 3) However, as I have said above, the dosage is really important.. how they compare two different things within each other?

How long they kept the cell with treated extracts? 24 h, 48 h, 72 h.. it is really important to investigate the cell viability. If they have not tried any other condition, the authors must clearly indicate the reason

I have not understood how the authors found the %yield given in Table 1. It is really not clear and it needs some additional discussion

The conclusion is really poor to indicate the final results.

Minor issues

Proteins are not metabolites, please correct this phrase "metabolites such as protein, polysaccharides and saponins.."

The term "metabolite profiling" in the title must be changed. Metabolite profiling is a term to be used generally for untargeted studies. It does not indicate the analysis of two different compounds.

Reviewer 2.

1. Line spacing should be 1.5 according to the journal rules.
2. Similar studies are included in the literature, as the authors point out. Therefore, the superiority of the study should be explained in more detail.
3. Trademark and specification of used ethanol, TLC plates, and TLC system must be given. All trademarks must be given their country.
4. If the addition of water improved the extraction efficiency, why did not author try

the ethanol percentage less than 50?

5. According to the Fig 1, results of with 70% ethanol more brighten than others. More explanation is needed.
6. Fig 2 has two spectra. The author have to explain detail.

2 attachments

 **A-602 Revision .docx**
20K

 **FABAD A-602 Manuscript.docx**
247K

rr retno widyowati <rr-retno-w@ff.unair.ac.id>
To: FABAD Ankara <fabadankara@gmail.com>

Sat, Apr 25, 2020 at 8:21 PM

Dear Editor FABAD Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

Thank you very much for your reviews on my article (A-602).
Herewith I send revisions and answers from the reviewer comments.
It is an honor for us to be able to contribute in this journal, so we hope our articles can be accepted.
Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Retno Widyowati, Phd.
[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **paper fabad-rev.docx**
341K

 **A-602 Revision .docx**
28K