

Rebamipide in gastric mucosal protection and healing: an Asian perspective

Response to Reviewers

[Cover Letter]

Dear Editor,

We appreciate you and the reviewers for your precious time in reviewing our paper and providing valuable comments. It was your valuable and insightful comments that led to possible improvements in the current version. The authors have carefully considered the comments and tried our best to address every one of them. We hope the manuscript after careful revisions meet your high standards. The authors welcome further constructive comments if any.

Below we provide the point-by-point responses. All modifications in the manuscript have been highlighted in red.

Sincerely,

Reviewer #1 comments:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

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. 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 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 general audience.

Author's response to Reviewer #1: The author thanks Reviewer 1 for the positive comments.

Reviewer #2 comments:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

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.

Author's response to Reviewer #2: The author thanks Reviewer 2 for the positive comments.

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? 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?

Author's response to Reviewer #2: The keywords ("Rebamipide", "peptic ulcer", "gastroesophageal reflux disease", and "mucosal protection") used to conduct the search for this narrative review have been added in the Methods section. No other specific inclusion/exclusion criteria were used to conduct this search as it is a narrative review and not a scoping review or a systematic literature review.

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?

Author's response to Reviewer #2: The abbreviation "REB" has been removed. *Helicobacter pylori* has been articulated in its entirety at its first mention in the 5th line of the Introduction section. Reference 39 did not report on the significance of the difference in *H. pylori* eradication between the 3 groups. Instead, it showed that inflammation was significantly lower in the groups that used Rebamipide.

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 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.

Author's response to Reviewer #2: The references in the main text and Table 1 have been checked to ensure that they correspond. A section on the future prospects of the use of Rebamipide in the treatment of gastrointestinal diseases has also been added in the section "Prospects in the use of Rebamipide" as follows:

The future of Rebamipide in gastrointestinal disease treatment looks promising, particularly as ongoing research explores its potential in treating conditions like irritable bowel syndrome and functional dyspepsia, and as a preventive against the development of gastric cancer (Kovaleva et al. 2023; Lee et al. 2021). Further studies and clinical trials will help to clarify its full potential, establish optimal dosing regimens, and assess its role in combination therapies. As a safe and effective gastroprotective agent, Rebamipide could become an increasingly important part of the treatment landscape for chronic and complex GI conditions.

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.

Author's response to Reviewer #2: The author thanks Reviewer 2 for the positive comments.

Editorial Office's comments

1) Science Editor:

1 Scientific quality: The authors submitted a minireview of rebamipide in gastric mucosal protection and healing.

(1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C;

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The reviewers acknowledged the manuscript as a comprehensive and informative narrative review on rebamipide's role in gastrointestinal diseases, highlighting its mechanism, efficacy, and side effects. Suggestions included clarifying inclusion criteria for curated literature, defining abbreviations consistently, and ensuring the alignment of references with the main text. Additional data were recommended to verify findings in cited studies and enhance persuasiveness. The reviewers also suggested discussing future applications of rebamipide and refining grammar and structure to improve readability and coherence.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: All these changes have been done

(3) References recommendations: The reviewer didn't request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.

(4) Manuscript Type: After verification, the manuscript type has been changed from "Review" to "Minireviews".

2 Specific comments

(1) Country/Territory of origin: India

(2) The language classification is Grade B and Grade B. Please provide the latest Language certificate after Return the Manuscript to Author for Revision. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies that we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: This has been done

(3) Manuscript Title:

Except for capitalization of the first word, all other words are represented in lowercase (excluding specific words such as Crohn's disease).

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: This has been done

(4) Author contributions: The author's names will be listed in the following format: full family (sur)name, followed by abbreviated first and middle names. For example, Bryan L Copple should be revised as Copple BL.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments:

(5) Audio Core Tip. In order to attract readers to read the full-text article, we request that the first author make an audio file describing the final core tip. This audio file will be published online, along with the article. The author can invite English language editing company to assist in resolving the language issues of Audio Core Tip.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments:

(6) Reference numbers in the main text.

The name of the author(s) of a reference is listed in the sentence, the reference number should be placed immediately after the author(s) of the reference. Example: Mandal *et al*[8] proposed that retractor aponeurosis disinsertion is the most likely cause of congenital low lid entropion.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: This has been done

(7) There are issues with the references:

To ensure the accuracy of the references, please use "Edit References by Auto-Analyser"

(<https://www.f6publishing.com/Forms/main/ArticleReferenceTool.aspx>) to edit the references of the manuscript.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: N/A

(8) Figures.

Original figure documents. In the meantime, authors should 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, and upload it to the file destination of "Image File" in the F6Publishing system.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: N/A

(9) Tables.

Abbreviations are not allowed in table titles

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: This has been corrected

(10) Please verify if all pictures (s) are original? 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 x). 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.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: N/A

(11) Acknowledgements: Brief acknowledgments should be included for persons who have made genuine contributions to the manuscript and who endorse the data and conclusions. The name of commercial companies, such as English language editing companies, should not be present in this section.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: N/A

3 Recommendation: Transfer to other BPG journals (*World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*).

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Transfer to another BPG Journal

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: The author thanks the Editorial Office for their recommendation

2) **Company Editor-in-Chief:**

I recommend the manuscript to be published in the *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*.

Author's response to Editorial Office comments: The author thanks the Editorial Office for their recommendation