

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58293

**Title:** Chinese medicine formulas for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Overview of systematic reviews

**Reviewer's code:** 02444986

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-03 10:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-06 17:07

**Review time:** 3 Days and 6 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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**

Authors used A Measure Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews 2 (AMSTAR 2) and Risk of Bias in Systematic Review (ROBIS) in order to evaluate systematic reviews on the effectiveness of traditional Chinese's medicine (TCM) on treatment of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). They concluded that current studies are inadequate and rigorous RCTs are needed. The manuscript has too many technical data with very few clinical results. I strongly recommend the manuscript to be reviewed by a statistician who is an expert on AMSTAR2 and ROBIS methods.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58293

**Title:** Chinese medicine formulas for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Overview of systematic reviews

**Reviewer's code:** 00000663

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-03 06:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-13 21:05

**Review time:** 10 Days and 14 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

A reasonable analysis of Chinese medicine formulas for the treatment of NAFLD. The analysis is based on an overview of systematic reviews (both RCT and non-randomized studies). The outcomes were largely focused on biochemistry or radiology, without any evidence derived from hard end-points. The authors also scored the methodological quality of studies – the best part of the study -, and concluded for a general low quality. Finally, only two formulas survived the analysis, but the end-points were soft (radiologic improvement and ALT normalization). Problems 1. Needless to say that radiologic improvement, due to subjective ascertainment, is of low value. While the presence of liver fat is well described by US, a quantitative analysis is poorly representative of the burden of lipid accumulation. This point should be more clearly expressed in the discussion. 2. Similarly, there is modest evidence that ALT levels are predictive of the severity of disease, although ALT reduction is frequently assumed as a therapeutic target. In principle, there is large evidence that the severity of disease appears to be totally independent of ALT levels. 3. Also this issue should be more clearly expressed and discussed. 4. This also means that most of the final conclusions should be downgraded as to the effectiveness of treatment. 5. For non-experts in Chinese medicine, an explanatory report of the different formulas might be of help. What do they contain? Herbal medicine?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58293

**Title:** Chinese medicine formulas for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Overview of systematic reviews

**Reviewer's code:** 02462675

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-10 00:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-18 02:06

**Review time:** 8 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments to the Authors: I agreed with the authors that most of the systematic reviews have poor methodological quality and possessed a high risk of bias. In the current Overview review, unfortunately the number of included systematic reviews is very small (7 only) so it is unrealistic to conclude results regarding the efficacy of TCM formulas for NAFLD. The authors can't rely on only two systemic reviews to decide that TCM formulas may have benefits. Actually, we can't get any reliable or trustable or informative conclusion from two reviews. Therefore, in the conclusion the authors should recommend that all future research should focus on designing rigorous RCTs rather than repeatedly conducting meaningless systematic reviews while the conclusion about the efficacy of TCM formulas for NAFLD should be removed because of poor quality and insufficient included systematic reviews