



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 89253

Title: A bibliometrics analysis based on the Web of Science: Current trends and perspective of gastric organoid during 2010–2023

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-15 06:19

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-20 04:27

Review time: 4 Days and 22 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this manuscript presents innovative ideas clearly and effectively. The structure is well-organized, and the writing is clear and concise. The author has done an excellent job of explaining a complex technical process in an easy-to-understand way. However, to improve the manuscript, the author should ensure that the references cited in the introduction and related work section are thoroughly addressed in the reference section. Additionally, the introduction should provide an extended version of the abstract, with elaboration on the key points and supportive ideas and references. Lastly, the conclusion section needs revision to provide a more insightful and comprehensive summary of the manuscript. Finally, the author should ensure that all references are properly formatted according to the relevant rules.