



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 85788

Title: Green tea polyphenols alleviate di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate-induced liver injury in mice

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00609434

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-15 08:28

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-27 10:19

Review time: 12 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish |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 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 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

The manuscript from Shi et al. is an in vivo study investigating the protective properties of green tea polyphenols on phthalate-induced liver damage. The data presented are really interesting, there is a lot of work done and in general the paper is well written, although there is a big problem with the readability of most of the figures. An act of faith is needed when reading the results of this paper because it is impossible to interpret the figures. In particular, Fig. 2 from B to G, Fig. 6 and 7, the legend of Fig 8B and Fig 9, panels A, C, D and F must be redrawn to allow people to read what’s inside them. Minor points: I would suggest revising the Discussion because in most cases the literature is cited without any link to the results reported in the paper, so it is not possible to understand the reasoning of the authors when citing the work of others, since they do not explain the correlation between the results reported by other groups and theirs. The abstract is too long.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 85788

Title: Green tea polyphenols alleviate di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate-induced liver injury in mice

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04653160

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ukraine

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-28 06:56

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-07 17:59

Review time: 9 Days and 11 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 |
| 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 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

line 190 - it looks like a typo: not kidney, but livers were obviously harvested some questions to study design: why some groups received corn oil? If it served as a solvent for GTPs (solvents should be indicated by the way) - why the third group received all the substances (DEHP, corn oil, and GTPs)? Why the volume of corn oil was the same for all animals and didn't respect the animals weight (like mL/kg)? Line 328-329: authors mentioned that "Mice ... did not exhibit aberrant behaviors in urination, defecation, food intake, or water consumption", but they actually didn't measure food and water intake. Line 331: it is unclear, how liver index was calculated. Fig.2B-G should be improved: very small letters and numbers and uncommon bars. It would be good to design Fig.2B-G as Figs. 3B,C, 5B, 4C Fig.4B,C: Connective tissue is presented in healthy liver, so it is strange that the authors didn't find it at all in the mentioned groups. Line 390: it is difficult to say something about statistically significant difference between the groups in electron-microscopy study, because this data was collected from one animal per group.