

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 79331

Title: Xiaojianzhong decoction prevents the progression of MNNG-induced gastric precancerous lesions in a rat model by inhibiting autophagy and glycolysis in gastric mucosal cells

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05754965

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-16

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-23 17:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-26 20:12

Review time: 3 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	<p>Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? [J31] Yes [J30] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? [J41] Yes [J40] No</p> <p>Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? [J51] Yes [J50] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? [J61] Yes [J60] No</p>
Language quality	<p>[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection</p>
Conclusion	<p>[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection</p>
Re-review	<p>[Y] Yes [] No</p>
Peer-reviewer statements	<p>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No</p>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study investigating the role of a traditional Chinese medicine Xiaojianzhong decoction in preventing the progression of MNNG-induced gastric precancerous lesions. The authors firstly analyzed the chemical components in Xiaojianzhong decoction. Then, by using a rat model, they showed that Xiaojianzhong decoction could ameliorate gastric mucosal pathological conditions in MNNG-induced GPL rats. Mechanistically, they found that Xiaojianzhong decoction exerted this protective role by regulating autophagy and glycolysis via PI3K/AKT/mTOR and p53/AMPK/ULK1 signaling pathways. This study is well designed. The writing is good. Here I have the following minor questions. (1) A major flaw in Chinese traditional medicine is the lack of precision. Since you have identified the main components of Xiaojianzhong decoction, it is necessary to perform experiments to see which one or



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

which combination is the effective components conferring Xiaojianzhong decoction this protective effect in your study. (2) p53 is a master regulator of cellular metabolism, including autophagy and glycolysis (PMID: 33785447). However, in your introduction and discussion, there is little content to introduce or discuss the importance of p53-mediated metabolic regulation in your system. You need to add these contents. (3) All the WB figures need internal control band. (4) In the caption of figure 2, there should be a space between “liver,” and “kidney”.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 79331

Title: Xiaojianzhong decoction prevents the progression of MNNG-induced gastric precancerous lesions in a rat model by inhibiting autophagy and glycolysis in gastric mucosal cells

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-16

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-31 12:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-31 13:02

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	<p>Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? [J31] Yes [J30] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? [J41] Yes [J40] No</p> <p>Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? [J51] Yes [J50] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? [J61] Yes [J60] No</p>
Language quality	<p>[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection</p>
Conclusion	<p>[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection</p>
Re-review	<p>[Y] Yes [] No</p>
Peer-reviewer statements	<p>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No</p>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and organized. His reading is fluent. Regarding the content, it is an original contribution. Likewise, it represents an advance in the area of knowledge. The article presents a well-designed experiment. The work methodology, the results and a discussion of them are presented. However, it should be improved in 2 aspects: a) The state of the art of the article should be expanded. b) The conclusions are very limited. The scientific contribution and a set of lines of future work must be indicated. c) In the discussion section, the description of the sales and limitations of the results obtained should be improved.