

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 91841

**Title:** Exploring the Pathogenesis from autophagy and Screening Natural Drugs for Therapeutic Potentials of active Ulcerative Colitis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03837089

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Taiwan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-01-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-01-07 15:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-10 14:19

**Review time:** 2 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<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
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

After reviewing this study, I strongly suggest the authors splitting this article into two. Despite the current article shows some novelty to UC pathology and treatment, the novelty of this article is minor. If the authors can split this article into two, the novelty will be greater. Second, the authors use autophagy as a target for UC treatment. However, the pathological role of autophagy in UC progression is not clear, at least in the introduction of this article. Therefore, the reader cannot understand the rationale of targeting autophagy for UC treatment. Continuous from the aforementioned suggestion, autophagy in disease progression can be therapeutic or pathologic. For diminishing pathologic autophagy, inhibitors are necessary; otherwise, activators would be a choice. However, the molecular docking can just present the simulation of binding rather than promotion or inhibition of the autophagy. If the authors want to claim TCMSP benefit in UC treatment, wet lab data for assessing the influence of the autophagy activity is necessary. Continuous from the aforementioned suggestion. The authors found several autophagy-related genes in UC specimen. However, such genes are upstream or downstream mediators of UC progression is not evaluated in this study. This limitation

diminishes the novelty of this study.