

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 90193

Title: Chaiqin Chengqi Decoction as an adjuvant treatment for mild/moderately severe

hypertriglyceridemic acute pancreatitis: a retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03475330

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-07 00:49

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-07 01:46

Review time: 1 Hour

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled " Chaiqin Chengqi Decoction as an adjuvant treatment for mild/moderately severe hypertriglyceridemic acute pancreatitis: a retrospective study" has been reviewed. This paper evaluates the efficacy of CQCQD on TG and APOA1 levels, bowel movement recovery time and gastrointestinal function in HTG-AP patients. The paper is interesting, but needs some revision. Is CT used to assess pancreatitis? How many days is the CQCQD taken internally? In other words, do people stop taking it when their symptoms improve? Or do they continue to take it internally after that? When should oral medication be stopped? This paper is a RETROSPECTIVE STUDY, so a detailed analysis would be possible. How many people had no effect? Are there any characteristics of the people who had no effect? On the other hand, what are the characteristics of those who are more likely to respond to the CQCQD? What side effects do they have?



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 90193

Title: Chaiqin Chengqi Decoction as an adjuvant treatment for mild/moderately severe

hypertriglyceridemic acute pancreatitis: a retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03647199

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-06 11:18

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-08 10:03

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
uns manuscript	[ ] Grade D. No creativity of innovation



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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

As a reviewer, I have meticulously assessed the manuscript detailing the impact of Chaiqin Chengqi Decoction (CQCQD) in the treatment of hypertriglyceridemia-induced acute pancreatitis (HTG-AP). The study presents a retrospective analysis of 39 HTG-AP patients, comparing the efficacy of CQCQD against a conventional treatment regimen. The authors report that CQCQD significantly lowers triglyceride (TG) and Apolipoprotein A1 (APOA1) levels, improves gastrointestinal function, and reduces the inflammatory response. Summary of the Study: The study focuses on HTG-AP, a condition increasing in prevalence and often associated with severe outcomes. It evaluates the therapeutic potential of CQCQD, a traditional Chinese medicinal decoction, in comparison to conventional HTG-AP treatment. Results indicate that CQCQD is more effective in lowering TG levels, improving bowel movements, and reducing inflammation markers compared to the control group. Major Criticisms: Imaging Findings and Post-Treatment Changes: The study lacks detailed information on imaging findings such as CT scans, which are crucial for diagnosing and assessing the severity of acute pancreatitis. It is important to include and discuss the imaging results both at the



time of admission and after treatment to understand the impact of CQCQD and conventional treatment on the progression of HTG-AP. Adverse Events of CQCQD: The manuscript does not sufficiently address the potential adverse events associated with CQCQD. It is essential to provide detailed information on any side effects, complications, or risks involved in the treatment with CQCQD to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the safety profile of this treatment modality. Comparison of Adverse Events Between Groups: There is a need for a detailed comparison of adverse events between the CQCQD group and the control group. This comparison should include the nature, frequency, severity, and management of any adverse events that occurred during the treatment course. Such an analysis is vital for evaluating the safety and tolerability of CQCQD in comparison to conventional treatments. Mention of Hospital Stay Duration: The duration of hospital stay for patients in both treatment groups is not mentioned in the study. This information is significant as it can provide insights into the efficiency of the treatment modalities in terms of recovery time and resource utilization. Sample Size and Diversity: The sample size of 39 patients is relatively small for a conclusive comparative study. A larger sample would enhance the reliability of the results. Additionally, the demographic diversity of the patient population is not extensively discussed, which could impact the generalizability of the findings. Study Design: Being a retrospective study, there is a potential for selection and information bias. Prospective studies or randomized controlled trials would provide more robust evidence. Control Group Treatment: The study lacks clarity on the specifics of the conventional treatment regimen provided to the control group. Detailing this would allow for a more accurate comparison. Statistical Analysis: While the study employs statistical methods, there is a need for more robust statistical tools to analyze the data, particularly given the small sample size and the potential for confounding variables. Long-Term Effects and Follow-Up: The study does not discuss the long-term effects of CQCQD treatment and



lacks follow-up data. Understanding the long-term efficacy and safety of CQCQD is crucial. Minor Criticisms: Mechanism of Action: While the study hints at the possible mechanisms of action of CQCQD, it does not delve deeply into how these effects are achieved. A more detailed biochemical or molecular analysis would be beneficial. Reporting of Adverse Effects: The manuscript does not thoroughly report any adverse effects or complications associated with CQCQD, which is vital for a comprehensive understanding of the treatment's safety profile. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: The criteria for patient selection could be more clearly defined to understand the study population better. Data Presentation: Some of the data, particularly in graphical form, could be presented more clearly for ease of interpretation. Literature Contextualization: While the study references existing literature, there is room for a more thorough comparison with previous studies, which would provide a broader context for the findings. In conclusion, the study provides interesting insights into the potential benefits of CQCQD in treating HTG-AP. However, addressing the aforementioned major and minor criticisms would significantly strengthen the validity and impact of the findings.