



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*

**Manuscript NO:** 101753

**Title:** Rebamipide in Gastric Mucosal Protection and Healing: An Asian Perspective

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05855522

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-09-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Shang Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-11-08 04:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-11-08 08:13

**Review time:** 4 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<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| <b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| <b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><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<br><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)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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   |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed a literature review on the effectiveness of rebamipide for gastrointestinal diseases. This study provides a comprehensive overview and summarizes rebamipide's mechanism of action, effectiveness, and undesirable effects. The reviewer provides comments on the paper's revisions. 1 Title: Is the most important and compelling information included in the title? Yes. 2 Authors: Are the first author(s) and the corresponding author(s) leaders or active in the field? Yes. 3 Institution: Is the corresponding author's institution an important or recognized research institution or laboratory in the field? Yes. 4 Abstract: Does the content highlight the importance of the manuscript's topic to the field, the purpose of the research, the uniqueness of the method, and the novelty, significance, and impact of the results? Yes. 5 Key Words: Do the keywords express the characteristic elements and fully reflect the central content of the manuscript? Yes. 6 Introduction: Does the Introduction describe the consensus and theory on the topic, explain any current unknown issues or questions about the topic, propose critical issues that need to be addressed, and state the purpose of the study? Yes. 7 Materials and Methods/Experimental Procedure: Is the novelty of the new method,



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

new technique, or algorithm described in detail? Is each step of the experiment described in detail so that readers can repeat the experiment? Do the authors state that an ethics committee has approved the experiment? Is statistical probability analysis clearly stated? In the methods section, please elucidate the keywords used to curate the literature for this study. Could the authors clarify the criteria used to include and exclude the literature in this study? 8 Results: Are the results presented new and understandable to readers? Can the results be reproduced and are they directly related to the methods described? Did the authors discover a new method that improves on an existing one? Are the pictures and illustrations in the manuscript sufficiently self-explanatory? Does the manuscript display the data correctly? Is the manuscript easy to interpret and understand? Are the statistics and interpretation of the data appropriate and consistent throughout the manuscript? Are the figures and tables numbered in order of appearance in the manuscript? Are the tables three-line\* ones? \*Three-line tables include table numbers, table titles, table heads, table bodies, and table footnotes. Do pictures\* of the same theme use a single theme, and are the annotations for each picture stated separately? \*Pictures and line drawings generally consist of pictures/drawings, picture/drawing numbers, picture/drawing titles, and picture/drawing notes. Please explain the abbreviation REB or advise against its use for rebamipide. Please articulate *Helicobacter pylori* in its entirety at its first mention. Did the findings of reference 39 indicate a statistically significant difference in *H. pylori* eradication rates among the three groups? 9 Discussion: Does the Discussion adequately explain the results? Compared with other studies, what problems should have been solved in the study? Are the results of the study compared with those of previous studies? Are discoveries, methods, and techniques as well as the implications of the findings discussed? Are the limitations of the study acknowledged and discussed? Please verify that the references in Table 1 correspond accurately with those in the main text. This study's review aims to



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

assess the effectiveness of rebamipide in treating gastrointestinal diseases. Therefore, it is imperative to provide a description of the future prospects for the use of rebamipide in the treatment of gastrointestinal diseases. 10 Conclusion: Is the comprehensive manuscript writing, from the Title to the Conclusion, logical and coherent? Is the hypothesis of the study valid? Do the results of the study support the conclusion? Is the most significant finding of the study expressed clearly? Are the methods of the study adequately expressed so that they could be repeated? Are the implications of the study for the future expressed? Yes. 11 Acknowledgments: Acknowledgments should be expressed to institutions or individuals who have contributed to, supported, or helped with the study. The name of any commercial company is not allowed to be present in this section. No specific comments. 12 References: Are the references of the manuscript consistent with the subject of the manuscript? Does the manuscript include references to important relevant articles published within the last 3-10 years? Are important references missing from the manuscript's reference list? Do the authors cite their own published articles that are irrelevant to the subject of the manuscript? Are references sequentially cited in the text? Yes.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*

**Manuscript NO:** 101753

**Title:** Rebamipide in Gastric Mucosal Protection and Healing: An Asian Perspective

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05489614

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-09-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Shang Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-11-11 10:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-11-13 10:14

**Review time:** 1 Day and 23 Hours

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| <b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| <b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><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<br><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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><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**

1 Title: Is the most important and compelling information included in the title? Yes, it does. 2 Authors: Are the first author(s) and the corresponding author(s) leaders or active in the field? Yes, he does. 3 Institution: Is the corresponding author's institution an important or recognized research institution or laboratory in the field? Yes, it does. 4 Abstract: Does the content highlight the importance of the manuscript's topic to the field, the purpose of the research, the uniqueness of the method, and the novelty, significance, and impact of the results? Yes, it does. 5 Key Words: Do the keywords express the characteristic elements and fully reflect the central content of the manuscript? Yes, they do. 6 Introduction: Does the Introduction describe the consensus and theory on the topic, explain any current unknown issues or questions about the topic, propose critical issues that need to be addressed, and state the purpose of the study? Yes, it does 7 Materials and Methods/Experimental Procedure: Is the novelty of the new method, new technique, or algorithm described in detail? Is each step of the experiment described in detail so that readers can repeat the experiment? Do the authors state that an ethics committee has approved the experiment? Is statistical probability analysis clearly stated? Yes, it does.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

Note that it is a review manuscript. 8 Results: Are the results presented new and understandable to readers? Can the results be reproduced and are they directly related to the methods described? Did the authors discover a new method that improves on an existing one? Are the pictures and illustrations in the manuscript sufficiently self-explanatory? Does the manuscript display the data correctly? Is the manuscript easy to interpret and understand? Are the statistics and interpretation of the data appropriate and consistent throughout the manuscript? Are the figures and tables numbered in order of appearance in the manuscript? Are the tables three-line\* ones? \*Three-line tables include table numbers, table titles, table heads, table bodies, and table footnotes. Do pictures\* of the same theme use a single theme, and are the annotations for each picture stated separately? \*Pictures and line drawings generally consist of pictures/drawings, picture/drawing numbers, picture/drawing titles, and picture/drawing notes. Yes, they do 9 Discussion: Does the Discussion adequately explain the results? Compared with other studies, what problems should have been solved in the study? Are the results of the study compared with those of previous studies? Are discoveries, methods, and techniques as well as the implications of the findings discussed? Are the limitations of the study acknowledged and discussed? Yes, it does. 10 Conclusion: Is the comprehensive manuscript writing, from the Title to the Conclusion, logical and coherent? Is the hypothesis of the study valid? Do the results of the study support the conclusion? Is the most significant finding of the study expressed clearly? Are the methods of the study adequately expressed so that they could be repeated? Are the implications of the study for the future expressed? Yes, it does. 11 Acknowledgments: Acknowledgments should be expressed to institutions or individuals who have contributed to, supported, or helped with the study. The name of any commercial company is not allowed to be present in this section. 12 References: Are the references of the manuscript consistent with the subject of the manuscript? Does the manuscript



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

include references to important relevant articles published within the last 3-10 years? Are important references missing from the manuscript's reference list? Do the authors cite their own published articles that are irrelevant to the subject of the manuscript? Are references sequentially cited in the text? Yes, they do. 13 Abbreviations: Are abbreviations used correctly in the manuscript? Standard abbreviations should be defined in the Abstract, Core Tip, and main body of the manuscript upon first mention in the text. Certain commonly used abbreviations, such as DNA, RNA, HIV, LD50, PCR, HBV, ECG, WBC, RBC, CT, ESR, CSF, IgG, ELISA, PBS, ATP, EDTA, and mAb, do not need to be defined and can be used directly. 14 Language: Are there a large number of spelling errors, grammatical errors, tense errors, singular and plural errors, punctuation errors, or terminology errors in the manuscript? No, they don't. 15 Manuscript type: Is the content of the manuscript consistent with the type of the manuscript? Manuscript types include Editorial, Review, Frontier, Field of Vision, Minireview, Letter To The Editor, Correction, Retraction Note, Basic Study, Retrospective Study, Clinical Practice Study, Case Control Study, Observational Study, Retrospective Cohort Study, Clinical Trials Study, Prospective Study, Randomized Controlled Trial, Randomized Clinical Trial, Evidence-Based Medicine, Scientometrics, Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Case Report. It is a narrative review article. 16 Scientific research ethics: Was the study approved by an institutional ethics committee? If the study is a scientific and technological activity involving humans, including tests, surveys, and observational studies involving the use of human genes, human embryos, human biological samples, personal information, etc., it must be approved by an institutional ethics committee, and a reference number for such should be cited. If the study is a scientific and technological activity involving animals, it must be approved by an institutional ethics committee or an institutional animal ethics committee. Not applicable. Overall, I found this narrative review very informative, well written, well organized and clear. It is readable also for





**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** [office@baishideng.com](mailto:office@baishideng.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

general audience.