

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World	Journal of	Gastroenterology
-------------------------------	------------	------------------

Manuscript NO: 71108

Title: New treatment for gastroesophageal reflux disease: traditional medicine,

Xiaochaihu Decoction

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05307734 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-27 07:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-27 10:27

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript, a letter to editor, provided reasonable suggestion to a published clinical study evaluating the efficacy of Xiaochaihu Decoction (MXD) for gastroesophageal reflux disease (GRED). It can be considered for publication with some revision. abstract does not seem to be a good summary of the main content of the manuscript and thus need to be improved; The "Core Tips" part is also suggested to rewrite the sentences reasonably in a logical order; The main content of the manuscript is also suggested to rewrite and highlight the explanation of the reason for the recommendations and thus the suggestions on sample size, adverse reaction and the effects of prolonged MXD therapy can be clearly presented for readers. The Logical association between treatment risk in GERD of Proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) and MXD need to be clearly presentd, if it does exist.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 71108

Title: New treatment for gastroesophageal reflux disease: traditional medicine,

Xiaochaihu Decoction

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05122742 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACG, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Attending Doctor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-27 18:45

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-28 00:27

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors comment on study that examined the effect of alternative medicine in treatment of heart burn. It discuss the positives and negatives of the study. However authors should follow more or less the flow of letter to editor. It needs to summarize the status of problem, the actual study design, findings followed by discussing the strength and limitation of the study. By reading this part: me as a reader will not need to go back and read the study. This part will need to be redone for the letter to be accepted in my opinion. I read the letter and was not able to understand what is the actual study discussed was in sufficient detail Then authors need to reflect on the study. Their comments and understanding of the study then how authors think the findings can be applied and discuss future directions.