

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82940

**Title:** Should Gastroenterologists Prescribe Cannabis? The Highs, the Lows and the Unknowns

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00001787

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-10 04:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-19 17:39

**Review time:** 9 Days and 13 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<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 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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

I read with interest the MS "Should Gastroenterologists Prescribe Cannabis? The Highs, the Lows and the Unknowns" by Tadros and coworkers. It is a comprehensive review MS dealing with a demanding issue coming from a leading Research Center. I have just a couple of minor suggestions: a) I understand Cannabis use is commonly not reported associated with constipation. However, opioid induced constipation is a common side effects of opids and even negative findings about Cannabis are welcomed in a review MS, b) the Authors use Rome Foundation classification for cannabis related hyperemesis and same attitude should be applied to IBS classification is Literature consent it. No additional points on this side

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82940

**Title:** Should Gastroenterologists Prescribe Cannabis? The Highs, the Lows and the Unknowns

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03537089

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Academic Editor, Associate Professor, Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-09 08:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-10 19:19

**Review time:** 1 Day and 10 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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

Addition in green underlined Deletion in red underlined Where is the list of abbreviations? Abstract section needs shortage and language correction as shown. Introduction needs shortage, and language correction. What is it?: Needs more arrangement. THE ENDOCANNABINOID SYSTEM: needs more arrangement and shortage. IBD section needs more scientific support, arrangement, and more shortage. GI motility section: needs shortage. Irritable Bowel Syndrome section: needs shortage. Abdominal pain/Visceral pain section: needs correction as shown. Nausea and Vomiting section needs shortage. Obesity section needs shortage and language correction as shown. GI Malignancies section needs shortage. RISKS AND ADVERSE SIDE EFFECTS section needs shortage, and arrangement. Conclusion needs more and more shortage. The paper needs more scientific support, and the topic needs more strong evidence based medicine to support the use of cannabis in GIT diseases. It needs major revision. see the revised paper.