

28 July, 2020

Editorial office

*World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: World Journal of Gastroenterology – 56083

Thank you very much for your email concerning our manuscript entitled “Antioxidant Activity and Hepatoprotective Effect of 10 Medicinal Herbs on CCl<sub>4</sub>-induced Liver Injury in Mice”. After carefully considering the points the reviewers raised and the Editorial Office’s comments and suggestions, we have made the following revisions.

**Reviewer #1:**

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The manuscript written by Meng et al. compares antioxidant and hepatoprotective activities of ten herbs, and identify and quantify phytochemicals for the one with strongest hepatoprotection. Many natural products confer health benefits against diverse diseases through their antioxidant activities. This study is of value to assist the selection of more effective natural products for direct consumption and the development of nutraceuticals or therapeutics to manage oxidative stress-related diseases. Very interesting study. And the manuscript is well written. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures and tables are very good, and well discussed. Thank you for giving opportunity to review your study.

Thank you very much for your comments.

**Reviewer #2:**

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The manuscript is focused on provide valuable information for the selection of more efficient herbs to protect against CCl<sub>4</sub>-induced liver injury, and to support the direct application of herbs or the development of novel therapies for the management of oxidative stress-related diseases. The design of the study is very good, the antioxidant activity of ten medicinal herbs was determined by both ferric-reducing antioxidant power (FRAP) and trolox equivalent antioxidant capacity (TEAC) assays. The herb with the strongest hepatoprotective performance

was analyzed for the detailed bioactive components by using high-performance liquid chromatography-electrospray ionization source-ion trap tandem mass spectrometry (HPLC-ESI-ITMS/MS). *S. officinalis* L. exhibited the strongest hepatoprotective effect, and the strongest *in vitro* activities were also found for *S. officinalis* L. The results are excellent, but not very clear, I think the author need to separate RESULTS and DISCUSSION. The study provided valuable information for the selection of more efficient herbs to protect against CCl<sub>4</sub>-induced liver injury, and to support the direct application of herbs or the development of novel therapies for the management of oxidative stress-related diseases. I recommend accepting this manuscript for publication after a minor editing.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for your comments, and the RESULTS and DISCUSSION was separated.

#### **Comments and suggestions from the Editorial Office**

##### ***(1) Science Editor:***

Recommend for potential acceptance.

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a basic study of the liver injury in mice. The topic is within the scope of the WJG.

(1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is focused on provide valuable information for the selection of more efficient herbs to protect against CCl<sub>4</sub>-induced liver injury, and to support the direct application of herbs or the development of novel therapies for the management of oxidative stress-related diseases. Very interesting study. And the manuscript is well written. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures and tables are very good, and well discussed. The results are excellent, but not very clear. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 5 figures. A total of 45 references are cited, including 9 references published in the last 3 years. There are 3

self-citations.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade B.

A language editing certificate issued by Wiley was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee Approval Form, and the ARRIVE guidelines. The study does not involve humans. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has published 1 article in the BPG.

5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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;

(2) I found the authors did not write the “article highlight” section. Please write the “article highlights” section at the end of the main text;

(3) please don't include any \*, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters. Statistical significance is expressed as  $aP < 0.05$ ,  $bP < 0.01$  ( $P > 0.05$  usually does not need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values,  $cP < 0.05$  and  $dP < 0.01$  are used, and a third series of P values is expressed as  $eP < 0.05$  and  $fP < 0.01$ .

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for your comments.

1 The questions raised by the reviewers have been answered.

5 (1) The original figures have been provided.

(2) The “Article Highlights” has been added.

(3) The superscript numbers have been used for illustration; and the superscript letters have been used for statistical significance.

**(2) Editorial Office Director:**

I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for your comments.

**(3) Company Editor-in-Chief:**

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, 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.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for your comments.

Thank you all very much for your help!

Yours sincerely,

Xiao Meng