# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 74749

**Title:** Anti-tumour activity and toxicological studies of combination treatment of Orthosiphon stamineus and gemcitabine on pancreatic xenograft model

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05469232

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-31 13:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-13 16:02

**Review time:** 13 Days and 2 Hours

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| [ Y] Grade A: Excellent    [   ] Grade B: Very good    [   ] Grade C: Good [   ] Grade D: Fair    [   ] Grade E: Do not publish |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

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [    ] Onymous |
| --- | --- |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [    ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Is there any reason why the route of administration of gemicitabine was subcutaneous injection instead of intravenous injection?

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 74749

**Title:** Anti-tumour activity and toxicological studies of combination treatment of Orthosiphon stamineus and gemcitabine on pancreatic xenograft model

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05330707

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-14 08:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-23 00:05

**Review time:** 8 Days and 15 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  [  ] Grade B: Minor language polishing  [ Y] 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 |

| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [   ] Onymous |
|---|---|
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Since 2013, nab-paclitaxel in combination with gemcitabine has been approved in many countries as a first-line treatment for patients with metastatic adenocarcinoma of the pancreas. The safety and efficacy of the combination of nab-paclitaxel followed by gemcitabine therapy has been established. Please described the advantage of Orthosiphon stamineum over nab-paclitaxel in discussion section.<br> In previous reports, Orthosiphon stamineum monotherapy was effective against HCT116 xenograft tumors (Reference #9, J Biochem Tech (2012) 3(5): S170-176). However, in this report using Panc-1 xenograft models, no anticancer effect was observed with Orthosiphon stamineum monotherapy. The authors should investigate why Orthosiphon stamineum monotherapy was not effective against Panc-1 xenograft tumors.<br> Discussion is too long with a lot of textbook knowledge and can be made shorter.<br>

| 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)   [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision   [ ] Major revision   [ ] Rejection |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [ ] Onymous |

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All my comments have been addressed. No further comments.