

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 30743

Title: A Multi-center Randomized Double-blind Placebo-controlled Clinical Study

Reviewer's code: 03478871

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jing Yu (Quit in 2017)

Date sent for review: 2016-11-11

Date reviewed: 2016-11-19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article show that Chinese medicine improve FD. But there are no data about degree of temporary effectiveness. Minor revision 1) Authors should unify control group or placebo group. 2) This Chinese medicine was effective in almost evaluations for eight weeks. Why this medicine has been effective for eight week including no treatment four weeks? 3) Figure four is not good. Authors had better to show temporal changes of each groups with a line chart Major revision 1) Why did authors include clinical global impression scale or hospital anxiety and depression scale? Authors had better show its importance or necessity in introduction or discussion. 2) In table 5, are numbers of placebo group and treatment group 202 and 202? 3) There is no information about adverse effects. 4) How many percentage were the effective patients? How much did the medicine improve? There are no graph about temporary change.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 30743

Title: A Multi-center Randomized Double-blind Placebo-controlled Clinical Study

Reviewer's code: 02941690

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Jing Yu (Quit in 2017)

Date sent for review: 2016-11-24

Date reviewed: 2016-11-28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is well described and good at the clinician of gastroenterology. Therefore, I think that this paper is good to publish at WJG