

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*

**Manuscript NO:** 69646

**Title:** Melatonin restores zinc levels, activates the Keap1/Nrf2 pathway, and modulates endoplasmic reticular stress and HSP in rats with chronic hepatotoxicity

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03768177

**Position:** Editor-in-Chief

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Postdoc, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-08 22:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-14 23:28

**Review time:** 6 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

• The original finding is completely lacking in the study design, as many research have already proved this research question and provide enough mechanism evidence. You need to provide adequate reasoning as how this study is different and have novelty in providing new scientific information.

• The methods are old and now provide any significance means of using technology to find more evidence/details in the data.

• The conclusion part is not written well. You need to adequately write the conclusion with study gaps, and recommendation for future work.

• The language throughout the test needs to be revised with grammatical, syntax, paragraph corrections. Also, the writing structure need to be revised.

• The statistical analysis in figures is not correct. Check it and correct it. Also, you need to change the discussion accordingly.

• The SI unit need to be written perfectly.. nmoles/mg protein?

• Table 1 values need to be corrected. You have used, in zinc values.