

Review of: "Anti-metastasis After Bee Venom and Melittin by Upregulation of BRMS1 and DRG1 Genes, With Downregulation of WNT7B in Breast Cancer Cells"

Elizabeth Cristina Perez Hurtado¹

¹ Universidade Paulista

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject covered here is interesting; however, changes are obligatory for the improvement of the manuscript.

Major comments:

- Please revise grammatical and writing errors in the entire manuscript. Correction of English language errors is mandatory.
- The title should be rewritten.
- To improve understanding of the results in Figure 1, add the graphs corresponding to the MTT test results. Table 1 is not necessary.
- In relation to the wound healing test, explain the criteria for choosing concentrations not tested in the MTT assay. This information could be added to the discussion.
- To avoid erroneous conclusions from the wound healing test results, were times between 6 and 24 hours checked? This information could be added to the discussion.
- Although the chosen concentrations induce low cytotoxicity, how can we explain the proliferation increase in the treatment with melittin when compared to the bee venom and cisplatin treatments at 30 hours? This information could be added to the discussion.
- The quality of the figures and tables is not satisfactory. Please standardize the presentation of the figures and describe better the information about them (figure legend). Add statistical analysis. For publication purposes, please ensure that each of your figure files (graphs and micrographs) has a resolution of at least 300 dpi and verify the font size of titles within the figures to improve readability.
- It is recommended that gene expression graphs be presented in dispersion format. Add the number of replicates, the statistical test in the text, and the figure legend. Increase the font size of titles within figures.
- Include in the discussion that other components of bee venom could influence the decrease in EGFR. Explain this finding better.

- Check the presentation/structure of the results and discussion sections. The description of results is very weak. In the current format, it is recommended to leave the discussion in a separate section and further explore the results obtained in the work with already published articles.

Minor comments

Please revise the number on the first figure.