

# **Response letter**

Thank you for your constructive comments. By reading your suggestions, I have once again double-checked and refined this paper.

## **REVIEWER'S COMMENTS**

### **Reviewer #1:**

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The basic idea and subject of this manuscript are interesting. The study aim is clear and methodology is well presented. However, I would recommend some major revisions regarding manuscript writing before publication as suggested below:

- 1- Writing style should be improved by correcting flaws in spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- 2- In the abstract, please clarify what each abbreviation stands for?
- 3- In introduction, I think that some sentences are left without appropriate citation.
- 4- In the introduction and also discussion, the authors mention some sentences about the effect of “Bai he Di huang Tang” on soul, mind and heart according to Chinese traditional medicinal. I would recommend explaining this section in more details or use another writing style to make it more clear to foreign readers.
- 5- In methodology section, authors mention that they used AutoDockTools-1.5.6 software and PyMOL software. What about autodock vina? What is the PDB crystal code for CDK2 protein.
- 6- In methodology of network diagram, authors mention that the plant has 17 active ingredients but in table 1 there are 16 compounds only.
- 7- Please check the spelling of some words and compounds like “llsitolosterol” and “dousterol”.
- 8- The discussion should be more accurate and concise and related to results of this study.

### **Response:**

- 1.I have improved my writing style again and polished my language in many ways.
- 2.The abbreviations in the abstract have been changed to full names.
- 3.The introduction has been revised again and new references have been added.
- 4.In the introduction and also discussion, we mention some sentences about the effect of “Bai he

Di huang Tang” on soul, mind and heart according to Chinese traditional medicinal. We have improved our new writing style and changed the difficult traditional Chinese medicine into a language that foreigners can understand.

5. Due to incomplete and inaccurate description of molecular docking, this part has been rewritten.

6. The number of active ingredients has been reviewed and revised uniformly.

7. The spelling of words and compounds has been checked and modified.

8. The discussion section has been revised again.

Once again, thank you for your valuable comments.

**Reviewer #2:**

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: 1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words “as treatment” may be as “as a treatment”; “TCMSP” as “the TCMSP”; “before breast” as “before a breast”; “anxiety-depression” as “the anxiety-depression”; “the subsequent” as “subsequent”; “Uniprot” as “the Uniprot”; “of herbal” as “of the herbal”; “anxiety depression” as “anxiety and depression or anxiety-depression”; “PPI” as “a PPI”; “component” as “a component”; “STRING11.0” as “the STRING11.0”; “chemical” as “the chemical”; “A binding” as “Binding”; “energy less” as “energy of less”; “chapters of” as “chapters on”; “calming mind” as “calming the mind”; “lung” as “the lung”; “heart” as “the heart”; “that by” as “that”; “in S” as “in the S”; “therapeutic” as “the therapeutic”; “ESR1” as “the ESR1”; “estrogen receptor” as “the estrogen receptors”. The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words “finally 43” may be as “finally, 43”; “[1].Some” as “[1]. Some”; “depression tendency” as “depression tendencies”; “[2].The” as “[2]. The”; “[3].Clinical” as “[3]. Clinical”; “[4],and” as “[4], and”; “[5, 6].The” as “[5, 6]. The”; “[7],and” as “[7], and”; “compound in” as “compounds in”; “[9].According” as “[9]. According”; “disease related” as “disease-related”; “42,as” as “42, as”; “depression target” as “depression targets”; “ctions” as “actions”; “[12].The” as “[12]. The”; “bonding occur” as “bonding occurs”; “root slowly” as “roots

slowly”; “[13].Di” as “[13]. Di”; “[19].Myricetin” as “[19]. Myricetin”; “[20].Catalpol” as “[20]. Catalpol”; “ligand receptor” as “ligand-receptor”; “[25].It” as “[25]. It”; “[26].The” as “[26]. The”; “release,” as “releases,”; “[29],while” as “[29], while”; “[30],which” as “[30], which”; “[32].Therefore” as “[32]. Therefore”; “[35].One” as “[35]. One”; “[37];To” as “[37]; To”; check spelling for “thais”. The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, TCMSP. ADME, etc.,). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated. 4. In the introduction, the authors should give the recent data about the prevalence of breast cancer, since the reference cited is 2016 and also not related with prevalence data and in general. 5. The authors should include the versions of the software in materials and methods or wherever applicable. 6. The table and figure legends should be improved and a proper footnote should be given. All legends should have enough description for a reader to understand the table and figure without having to refer back of the main text of the manuscript. 7. The authors may improve the discussion of their work by focusing on the present findings and introducing data from other authors who also worked with the same or other studies with recent references. 8. The conclusion (summary) section appears to be just a detailed summary of results/observations. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel, impactful based on the strong support of the data/results/discussion. Moreover, the authors may be included the limitation of the present findings and future direction for a better understanding of the manuscript. And also the authors should change the heading summary as conclusion.

**Response:**

- 1.Grammatical errors in the manuscript have been corrected and professionally polished.
- 2.The full text of the manuscript has been proofread, and the errors mentioned and not mentioned have been corrected.
- 3.All abbreviations in the manuscript have been corrected as required.
- 4.The description of the prevalence of breast cancer in the introduction has been re edited and the references have been changed.
- 5.The software used in the material method has been clearly labeled.

6.Footnotes have been added to the figures and tables in the text for explanation.

7.The discussion part has been modified according to the suggestions.

8.The conclusion part has been modified according to the suggestions.

Once again, thank you for your valuable comments.

## **EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS**

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. However, the quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must

supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

**Response:**

Thank you for your constructive comments. We have revised it accordingly as following:

First, the article has been retouched by a professional language retouching company. Secondly, the article pictures have been modified and sorted into ppt format as required. Finally, RCA has been used to search relevant articles to further improve the manuscript.