



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81989

Title: Antihepatoma Peptide, Scolopentide, Derived from the Centipede Scolopendra subspinipes mutilans

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05429043

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-19 05:05

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-19 10:26

Review time: 5 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



Peer-reviewer statements	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

1. Introduction part: The work is quite interesting but needs clarity in some portions for example However, current studies focus on antimicrobial and anticoagulation agents rather than tumours. However, the loss of p53 is common in the clinic 2. Methodology part: Cells at the logarithmic growth stage were collected, and the density was adjusted to 1×10^4 cells/mL (usually in 96 wells, it is very difficult to seed 10000 cells) Please check the cell count 3. Result: Instead of using g suppression ratio, it would be good to use relative cell viability (figure 1) a. Not much difference in tumour treated (figure 3) b. Figure 4..the concentration of the image is not specified c. figure 5 is overwhelming with many pictures, it is confusing d. all the figures resolution should be 300dpi e. "a CCK8 assay showed that the IC50 were 22.06 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ (extracted scolopentide) and 237.726 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ (synthesized scolopentide), which indicates the antihepatoma activity of synthesized scolopentide was weaker than that of the extracted scolopentide.: please justify that..why the same compound has activity difference. It should not be so. or else activity is lost during synthesis. Find out the reason and repeat the experiment 4. Whether the authors used extracted /synthesized compounds for further studies 5. The synthesis part is missing in the methodology 6. Figure 7 is graphical abstract. it should be clear with all points 7. Discussion and conclusion should be elaborated with more supporting literature



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81989

Title: Antihepatoma Peptide, Scolopentide, Derived from the Centipede Scolopendra subspinipes mutilans

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457095

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-26 15:39

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-13 11:38

Review time: 17 Days and 19 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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

Peer-reviewer statements	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

I consider the work to be very good and complete and with a little tidying up it is ready for publication.