



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 95513

Title: Efficacy and Safety of Tripterygium Wilfordii Glycosides Tablets Combined with Western Medicine for Patients with Rheumatic Immune Diseases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08300858

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Docotr

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-04-11

Reviewer chosen by: Hong-Xin Jiang

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-09-09 12:42

Reviewer performed review: 2024-09-09 13:10

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



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>

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

First of all, I would like to congratulate the authors of this manuscript for their accomplishment. It has been a privilege to read and evaluate it. I believe that the manuscript has great merit. Concise and appropriate writing, good methodological development, clear and comprehensive explanations. The manuscript really deserves a lot of attention in the publication process. However, one highly worrying thing that I observed was that the p-value of the heterogeneity of the studies was "0.64" in the abstract and "0.53" in the results section. This makes me wonder if it would not be necessary for the authors to analyze subgroups in order to improve their knowledge of possible subvariables that are involved in their analyses not only by the different values, as well as, because they are over than 0.05. It would be important to explain how the reviewers evaluated the articles, that is, whether they evaluated only the title, abstract, or full reading. It would be important to demonstrate how many articles were found in each database. Furthermore, i believe that there is a need to improve and expand a little more the discussion of the article. In this case, I would suggest that the authors of the manuscript provide a discussion regarding possible adverse effects of the use of



**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

combined therapy with Tripterygium wilfordii and Western medicine. I also think it is pertinent to highlight the access to this medication that the general public has and its costs. I also think it would be pertinent to consider the following. I think it would be important to mention a counterpoint, demonstrating that the use of this formulation is not consensual, with some literature not obtaining convincing results on this and, of course, explaining the possible reason for this occurrence. It would also be very important to explain why the dose was repeated between studies and whether a possible variation in dose could provide different results



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 95513

Title: Efficacy and Safety of Tripterygium Wilfordii Glycosides Tablets Combined with Western Medicine for Patients with Rheumatic Immune Diseases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08218857

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-04-11

Reviewer chosen by: Hong-Xin Jiang

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-09-09 00:46

Reviewer performed review: 2024-09-12 03:31

Review time: 3 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Introduction: Strengths: The introduction is informative and provides a detailed overview of rheumatic immune diseases, the limitations of current treatments, and the potential advantages of Tripterygium wilfordii glycosides tablets (TGT). It makes a strong case for the study's importance. Weaknesses: The introduction is somewhat lengthy and repetitive in sections. For instance, the discussion on the shortcomings of Western medicine could be condensed, focusing more on the rationale for combining TGT with Western therapies. Methods: Strengths: The methods section is comprehensive, explaining the search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and statistical methods. The use of PRISMA guidelines enhances the credibility. Weaknesses: While the methods are well-detailed, the section could be more concise in certain areas, particularly regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Some of the details about databases could be presented in a more straightforward manner. Results: Strengths: The results are clearly presented, with relevant statistical data, including relative risk and confidence intervals. The use of forest plots is appropriate for visualizing the meta-analysis findings. The inclusion of information on heterogeneity strengthens the results' interpretation.



**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

Weaknesses: The results section could benefit from additional interpretation of findings. While the data is presented well, the implications of heterogeneity (or lack thereof) and specific differences between studies should be expanded. The discussion around adverse effects could also be more detailed, particularly regarding the long-term safety of TGT.

Discussion: Strengths: The discussion section effectively places the findings within the broader context of existing literature. The positive effects of TGT in combination with Western medicine are supported by the data presented. The consideration of potential biases and limitations adds depth to the analysis.

Weaknesses: The discussion could benefit from a more critical analysis of the limitations. While biases are mentioned, the potential impact of these on the study's conclusions is not sufficiently explored. Additionally, more emphasis could be placed on the clinical applicability of the findings, especially given the limitations of the studies included in the meta-analysis.

Conclusion: Strengths: The conclusion is concise and effectively summarizes the study's findings, with a call for further high-quality research. The emphasis on the need for more studies to validate the findings adds a balanced perspective.

Weaknesses: The conclusion could be enhanced by providing more specific recommendations for future research, particularly regarding dosage, treatment duration, or patient subgroups that might benefit most from the combined therapy.

Tables and Figures: Strengths: The tables and figures (especially the forest plots and bias graphs) are appropriate and aid in the interpretation of the study's findings. They effectively summarize complex data.

Weaknesses: Some tables, particularly the one comparing adverse reactions, could benefit from more detailed captions to enhance interpretability without needing to refer back to the text.

Overall Strengths: The paper is well-structured and follows a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. The statistical analysis is robust, with a clear explanation of the methods used. The study addresses an important issue in the treatment of rheumatic immune diseases, with a focus on a novel treatment combination.



**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

Overall Weaknesses: The language could be more concise in certain sections to improve clarity and readability. The limitations, particularly regarding study quality and heterogeneity, need to be more critically addressed. The conclusion, while strong, could provide more actionable insights for clinical practice and future research. Recommendations for Improvement: Conciseness: Reduce repetitive elements in the introduction and methods sections to improve readability. Interpretation: Expand on the clinical implications of the findings, particularly regarding long-term safety and specific patient populations. Limitations: Provide a more critical discussion of the study's limitations and how they might affect the interpretation of the results. Language and Style: Use more straightforward language, especially when describing methodological details.