PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78810

Title: Molecular mechanisms of Baihedihuang decoction as a treatment for breast cancer related anxiety: A network pharmacology and molecular docking study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05393454

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-29 05:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-31 12:10

Review time: 2 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "as treatment" may be as "as a treatment"; "TCMSP" as "the TCMSP"; "before breast" as "before a breast"; "anxiety-depression" as "the anxiety-depression"; "the subsequent" as "subsequent"; "Uniprot" as "the Uniprot"; "of herbal" as "of the herbal"; "anxiety depression" as "anxiety and depression or anxiety-depression"; "PPI" as "a PPI"; "component" as "a component"; "STRING11.0" as "the STRING11.0"; "chemical" as "the chemical"; "A binding" as "Binding"; "energy less" as "energy of less"; "chapters of" as "chapters on"; "calming mind" as "calming the mind"; "lung" as "the lung"; "heart" as "the heart"; "that by" as "that"; "in S" as "in the S"; "therapeutic" as "the therapeutic"; "ESR1" as "the ESR1"; "estrogen receptor" as "the estrogen receptors". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "finally 43" may be as "finally, 43"; "[1].Some" as "[1]. Some"; "depression tendency" as "depression tendencies"; "[2].The" as "[2]. The"; "[3].Clinical" as "[3]. Clinical"; "[4],and" as "[4], and"; "[5, 6].The" as "[5, 6]. The"; "[7],and" as "[7], and"; "compound in" as "compounds in"; "[9].According" as "[9]. According"; "disease related" as "disease-related"; "42,as" as "42, as"; "depression target" as "depression targets"; "ctions" as "actions"; "[12].The" as "[12]. The"; "bonding occur" as "bonding occurs"; "root slowly" as "roots slowly"; "[13].Di" as "[13]. Di"; "[19].Myricetin" as "[19]. Myricetin"; "[20].Catalpol" as "[20]. Catalpol"; "ligand receptor" as "ligand-receptor"; "25].It" as "25]. It"; "[26].The" as "[26]. The"; "release," as "releases,"; "[29],while" as

"[29], while"; "[30],which" as "[30], which"; "[32].Therefore" as "[32]. Therefore"; "35].One" as "35]. One"; "[37];To" as "[37]; To"; check spelling for "thais". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.   3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, TCMSP. ADME, etc.,). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated.   4. In the introduction, the authors should give the recent data about the prevalence of breast cancer, since the reference cited is 2016 and also not related with prevalence data and in general.   5. The authors should include the versions of the software in materials and methods or wherever applicable.   6. The table and figure legends should be improved and a proper footnote should be given. All legends should have enough description for a reader to understand the table and figure without having to refer back of the main text of the manuscript.   7. The authors may improve the discussion of their work by focusing on the present findings and introducing data from other authors who also worked with the same or other studies with recent references.   8. The conclusion (summary) section appears to be just a detailed summary of results/observations. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel, impactful based on the strong support of the data/results/discussion. Moreover, the authors may be included the limitation of the present findings and future direction for a better understanding of the manuscript. And also the authors should change the heading summary as conclusion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78810

Title: Molecular mechanisms of Baihedihuang decoction as a treatment for breast cancer related anxiety: A network pharmacology and molecular docking study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05299889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Assistant Lecturer, Pharmacist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-06 06:15

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-06 08:37

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] 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: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The basic idea and subject of this manuscript are interesting. The study aim is clear and methodology is well presented. However, I would recommend some major revisions regarding manuscript writing before publication as suggested below: 1- Writing style should be improved by correcting flaws in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 2- In the abstract, please clarify what each abbreviation stands for? 3- In introduction, I think that some sentences are left without appropriate citation. 4- In the introduction and also discussion, the authors mention some sentences about the effect of "Bai he Di huang Tang" on soul, mind and heart according to Chinese traditional medicinal. I would recommend explaining this section in more details or use another writing style to make it more clear to foreign readers. 5- In methodology section, authors mention that they used AutoDockTools-1.5.6 software and PyMOL software. What about autodock vina? What is the PDB crystal code for CDK2 protein. 6- In methodology of network diagram, authors mention that the plant has 17 active ingredients but in table 1 there are 16 compounds only. 7- Please check the spelling of some words and compounds like "llsitosterol" and "dousterol". 8- The discussion should be more accurate and concise and related to results of this study.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] 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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. There are some grammatical, alignment and typographical errors are noted in the manuscript and it should be thoroughly checked and corrected throughout the manuscript. For example, the words "cancer related" may be as "cancer-related"; "guohua yang, fang wang" as "Guohua Yang, Fang Wang"; "beijing" as "Beijing"; "The the therapeutic" as "The therapeutic"; "Verbascoside , β-sitosterol , Stigmasterol ," as "Verbascoside, β-sitosterol, Stigmasterol,"; "anxiety ;" as "anxiety;"; "a network" as "network"; "in cell cycle" as "in the cell cycle"; "the lung cancer" as "lung cancer";   "of disease" as "of the disease"; "before breast" as "before a breast"; "S upporting" as "Supporting"; "the studying" as "studying"; "the herbal" as "herbal"; "The the chemical" as "The chemical"; "the the Traditional" as "the Traditional"; "pharmacokinetics ," as "pharmacokinetics,"; "the the chemical" as "the chemical"; "anxiety depression" as "anxiety and depression"; "160 the chemical" as "160 chemical"; "the the TCMSP" as "the TCMSP"; "for BCA" as "for the BCA"; "moleculaneuroactive" as "check and replace with right spelling"; "path way" as "pathway"; "medicine" as "medicine's"; "demonstrate good" as "demonstrate the good"; "the therapeutic" as "therapeutic"; "a components" as "components"; "a the" as "the"; "the the therapeutic" as "the therapeutic"; "therapies , furthermore," as "therapies , furthermore,"; "the the therapeutic" as "the therapeutic"; "the ESR1" as "ESR1"; "to exert" as "to exerting"; "[34] ，which" as "[34]，which"; "asVerbascoside , β-sitosterol , Stigmasterol ,mainly" as "as Verbascoside, β-sitosterol, Stigmasterol, mainly";   "BCAwith" as "BCA with".   2. The authors should do the abbreviations in both abstract and rest of the manuscript when first time appear and followed by only abbreviations. For example, Traditional Chinese Medicine Systems Pharmacology database (TCMSP) has been given with both

expansion and abbreviation in the text but only the expansion has been given in abstract. This should be properly checked the other abbreviations also.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78810

Title: Molecular mechanisms of Baihedihuang decoction as a treatment for breast cancer related anxiety: A network pharmacology and molecular docking study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05299889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Assistant Lecturer, Pharmacist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-15

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 19:03

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-05 19:32

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] 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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

After reading the revised version of the manuscript, I have noticed that authors had made good changes that greatly enhanced quality of manuscript. However, I have noticed minor writing mistakes that should be changed. For example, in the beginning of abstract and also materials and methods, the authors wrote "The the" that should be changed into "The" only. Also, I have noticed some missing spaces or extra spaces throughout manuscript. Finally, the conclusion should be shorter and more concise. I would recommend publication of manuscript after applying these minor changes.