



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 81413

**Title:** Yiwei Xiaoyu Granules for treatment of chronic atrophic gastritis with deficiency syndrome of the spleen and stomach

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 05753119

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Türkiye

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-01-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-02-11 15:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-02-17 20:47

**Review time:** 6 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Authors, I have completed a thorough review of the manuscript titled "Demonstration of the efficacy of Yiwei Xiaoyu granules for patients with chronic atrophic gastritis and deficiency syndrome of the spleen and stomach" by the authors from Chongqing, China. Overall, I find the study to be well-conducted and the results to be of significant interest to the readership. The study addresses an important gap in the literature regarding the treatment of chronic atrophic gastritis (CAG) and deficiency syndrome of the spleen and stomach (DSSS) with traditional Chinese medicine. The design of a double-blind, randomized, positive medicine-controlled trial is appropriate for assessing the efficacy of Yiwei Xiaoyu granules (YWXY) compared to Wei Fu Chun (WFC). However, I have a few suggestions for improving the clarity and completeness of the manuscript: Clarify the aim (you should give details) The manuscript states "medicine-controlled trial." Is this the correct term? Should it be "controlled trial"? It would be helpful if you could provide further information. Provide more information on the blinding procedures implemented in the study to ensure the integrity of the trial. Consider discussing any potential limitations of the study, such as the sample size and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com

**https://www.wjgnet.com**

generalizability of the findings. Similarity rate is high (35%). You should reduce it less than 20% Overall, I believe that this manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the field and should be considered for publication after addressing the minor revisions mentioned above.