



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 89179

Title: Nardostachyos Radix et Rhizoma-Rhubarb in the treatment of diabetic kidney disease based on network pharmacology and experimental verification

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Associate, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-02 14:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-02 14:22

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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



Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 89179

Title: Nardostachyos Radix et Rhizoma-Rhubarb in the treatment of diabetic kidney disease based on network pharmacology and experimental verification

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05299889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Assistant Lecturer, Pharmacist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-03 18:40

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-03 19:47

Review time: 1 Hour

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim and methodology of this manuscript are well-presented. The results are clear and correlate well with the methods used. However, I would suggest the following revisions to improve manuscript quality: 1- Authors are advised to improve integrity and cohesiveness of writing and also the flow of ideas. 2- Authors should state what each abbreviation stands for in the manuscript. 3- Some paragraphs were left with no citation. 4- I would argue against the following sentences as these claims are controversial "Clinical medications are mostly Angiotensin Converting Enzyme Inhibitors (ACEI) and sulfonylureas to improve renal blood circulation. Such drugs can damage other functions of the human body, so we need a natural drug and compound with few side effects." 5- Authors should write the genus and species name in the correct style. 6- Figure 7 is missing the required caption. 7- Authors should mention the version of Autodock and Pymol. Also, they should mention the PDB code for each target crystal.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 89179

Title: Nardostachyos Radix et Rhizoma-Rhubarb in the treatment of diabetic kidney disease based on network pharmacology and experimental verification

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06332072

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-02 03:21

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-09 07:21

Review time: 7 Days and 4 Hours

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



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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.The purpose of the study is to discover the molecular mechanism of the Gansong-Rhubarb drug pair (GRDP) for the treatment of diabetic kidney disease. "Gansong" and "Rhubarb" are two different ways of naming, which is not standardized.

2. This study showed that GRDP regulated the expression of p-STAT3, BAX, CASPASE3, and CASPASE9 proteins of TCMK-1 cells, which did not match the mechanism shown in Figure 7.

3. Several of the English language is not properly expressed, English writing skill needs to be improved. Check the accuracy of presentation and format in the whole manuscript is needed.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 89179

Title: Nardostachyos Radix et Rhizoma-Rhubarb in the treatment of diabetic kidney disease based on network pharmacology and experimental verification

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00532996

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-02 04:03

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-20 02:52

Review time: 17 Days and 22 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



Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors have reported the molecular mechanism of the Gansong-Rhubarb drug pair (GRDP) for the treatment of diabetic kidney disease. The receptor for advanced glycation end products (RAGEs), which is mediated by the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK), plays a critical role in the severity of chronic inflammatory disease diabetes mellitus. Authors have addressed role of AGE-RAGE pathway in DKD. Study is well designed and has translational potential applications. Few issues which need to be addressed are as below. 1. Molecular docking has provided good score. But Molecular dynamic simulations of those targets would validate stable binding kinetics of protein-target interactions. MDS needs to be performed for confirming stability and affinity. 2. Cell cycle kit and apoptosis links to be rectified and verified. Check other link details provided for correct hyperlink. 3. Flow meter term should be changed to Flow Cytometer and details of instrument used for sample acquisition and flow analysis should be provided. 4. If Chemidoc instrument was used for acquiring chemiluminescence, then machine details need to be provided. 5. For every technique, any positive and negative control used, need to be mentioned in methods section. 6. IL1b



**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

and TNF which are proinflammatory cytokines shown, they if validated in culture supernatants by ELISA , then it adds value to data. 7. Any experiments conducted to check expression of RAGE at genomic or protein levels may be reported. 8. Unit microlitre ul should be shown using symbol for micro and not use 'u'. 9. Minor : Gansong word may be spell checked for typographical errors within manuscript. 10. 'Graphd Prism 8.0 software' should be rectified with correct software name.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 89179

Title: Nardostachyos Radix et Rhizoma-Rhubarb in the treatment of diabetic kidney disease based on network pharmacology and experimental verification

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Associate, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: Cong Lin

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-06 15:47

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-06 15:52

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
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 89179

Title: Nardostachyos Radix et Rhizoma-Rhubarb in the treatment of diabetic kidney disease based on network pharmacology and experimental verification

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05299889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Assistant Lecturer, Pharmacist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-02

Reviewer chosen by: Cong Lin

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-08 06:39

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-08 06:50

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think authors have made the required changes to enhance the quality of manuscript. As such, I recommend the publication of this article.