

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

1. 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.

Reply:

Dear Reviewer, thank you for your insightful comments and suggestions. Following your guidance, I have made the following revisions to the manuscript:

1. I have added content from the abstract's background into the introduction, and have expanded on the results section and attached additional references in the discussion part.

2. The conclusion section has been revised to provide a more insightful and comprehensive summary of the manuscript's content. I have endeavored to ensure that this section more accurately reflects the significant findings and implications of the research.

3. All references have now been corrected and formatted in accordance with the relevant guidelines. I have meticulously checked each reference to ensure the accuracy and consistency of their format.

I hope these revisions meet the requirements of the review and further improve the quality of the paper. If there are any more areas in need of improvement, please do not hesitate to instruct.

2. *Science editor:*

- (1) Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewers have given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Classification: Grade B; Language Quality: Grade A. 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.

Reply: Dear *Science editor*, thank you for your insightful comments and suggestions. Following your guidance, I have made the following revisions to the manuscript:

- 1. I have added content from the abstract's background into the introduction, and have expanded on the results section and attached additional references in the discussion part.**
- 2. The conclusion section has been revised to provide a more insightful and comprehensive summary of the manuscript's content. I have endeavored to ensure that this section more accurately reflects the significant findings and implications of the research.**
- 3. All references have now been corrected and formatted in accordance with the relevant guidelines. I have meticulously checked each reference to ensure the accuracy and consistency of their format.**

I hope these revisions meet the requirements of the review and further improve the quality of the paper. If there are any more areas in need of improvement, please do not hesitate to instruct.

- (2) Main manuscript content: The author clearly stated the purpose of the study and the research structure is complete. However, the manuscript is still required a further revision according to the detailed comments listed below.

- (3) Table(s) and figure(s): There are 7 Figures and 5 Tables should be improved. Detailed suggestions for each are listed in the specific comments section.

- (4) References: A total of 36 references are cited, including 3 published in the last 3 years.

4) Language evaluation: The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. There are many errors in grammar and format, throughout the entire manuscript. Before final acceptance, the authors 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>.

Reply: Thank you for your valuable suggestion regarding the language quality of our manuscript. In line with your recommendation, we have engaged the services of Editage, a professional English language editing company suggested by your journal. We appreciate your guidance in this matter and have submitted the English Language Certificate as per the journal's requirements. We are grateful for your support in enhancing the clarity and readability of our work

5) Specific comments: (1) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A,B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. All legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. Such as Figure 1 title. A: ; B: ; C: .

Reply: We greatly appreciate your request for additional clarity in our manuscript's figures. In response, we have uploaded a PowerPoint (PPT) version of the figures as per your suggestion. We have ensured that all texts within these figures, including labels and arrows, are now editable to facilitate easier review and modification. We hope this meets your requirements and aids in the thorough evaluation of our work. Thank you for your guidance in enhancing the quality of our manuscript.

(2) Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published, and correctly indicate the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *World J Gastroenterol* 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

Reply: Thank you for your attention to the images in our manuscript. I would like to assure you that all images are original creations, specifically designed and developed for this study. They are unique to our work, and there is no requirement for permissions from previous publishers or copyright holders. We appreciate your concern for copyright integrity and hope this clarification addresses your query

(3) Please don't include any *, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; 500; 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.

Reply: Thank you for pointing out the presence of special symbols in our manuscript. As per your valuable suggestion, we have carefully reviewed the document and removed all such symbols to ensure better readability and conformity with the journal's formatting guidelines. We appreciate your guidance in this matter and have made the necessary revisions to meet the standards.

(4) Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words.

Reply: We are grateful for the suggestion to include a Core tip section. As per your advice, we have added this section to our manuscript to enhance its value and clarity for readers

(5) Please provide all fund documents.

Reply: Thank you for reminding us about the submission of funding documentation. We have compiled all relevant fund documents into a single PDF for clarity and convenience and have submitted it accordingly. We hope this consolidated format meets the journal's requirements effectively.

3. *Company editor-in-chief:*

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, 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.

When revising the manuscript, it is recommended that the author 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 PubMed, or a new tool, the RCA, of which data source is PubMed. RCA is a unique artificial intelligence system for citation index evaluation of medical science and life science literature. 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/>, or visit PubMed at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>.

Reply: Thank you for your valuable advice. Following your suggestion, I have enhanced the highlights of the manuscript by consulting the latest cutting-edge research results on PubMed. This has significantly enriched the content and I believe it now better reflects the current advancements in our field. Your guidance has been instrumental in improving the quality of our work