



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 113995

Title: Recent advances in spasmolytic polypeptide expressing metaplasia research

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03194899

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Associate Professor, MD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Türkiye

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-09-08

Reviewer chosen by: Hong-Xin Jiang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-09-17 10:17

Reviewer performed review: 2025-09-17 10:40

Review time: 1 Hour

Content to be reviewed	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? No Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes Are the Key Words complete? Yes Is the content of the Introduction adequate? Yes
-------------------------------	---



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

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?

Not Applicable

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **No**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Not Applicable**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **No**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? **Yes**

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **Yes**



	Does the research scope comply with ethics? Not Applicable
Scientific quality	Grade C (Good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Language quality	Grade C (Good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript presents a comprehensive and well-referenced review of spasmodic polypeptide-expressing metaplasia , highlighting important recent developments in the field. They tried to gain a deeper understanding of SPEM, this study summarizes the recent mechanistic roles of SPEM in gastric mucosal diseases. By elucidating these mechanisms, they aimed to provide deeper insights into the research and prevention 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

SPEM-related diseases. The authors demonstrate a clear understanding of the subject matter and have made an effort to incorporate a wide range of up-to-date literature. This makes the paper a potentially valuable contribution to the journal.

The most pressing concern is the style of writing. Many sentences are extremely long, contain multiple clauses, or are densely packed with information. While the scientific content is strong, the readability suffers. Simplifying the sentence structure and breaking down complex ideas into shorter, clearer statements would make the manuscript much easier to follow. A thorough language editing by a fluent English speaker or professional service is strongly recommended.

In several places, similar ideas, mechanisms, or pathways are repeated, sometimes with slight differences in wording. This gives the impression of redundancy and can distract the reader. Condensing overlapping content and avoiding repetition would improve the conciseness of the review.

The manuscript sometimes lacks smooth transitions between sections and paragraphs. Ideas are occasionally presented abruptly, without a clear link to what precedes them. Adding transitional sentences and signposting the structure (e.g., "In the following section, we will focus on...") would make the manuscript flow more naturally..

There are several typesetting error throughout the manuscript which makes reading difficult. The whole manuscript should be checked for typesetting errors.

Both abstract and conclusion could be strengthened. The abstract currently provides a general overview but could be more concise and highlight the novelty or unique perspective of this review. Similarly, the conclusion could benefit from a clearer summary of the main insights and potential future directions for research in this field

The manuscript has merit but requires major revision before being suitable for publication. Careful language polishing will substantially strengthen the work.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 113995

Title: Recent advances in spasmolytic polypeptide expressing metaplasia research

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08108835

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-09-08

Reviewer chosen by: Hong-Xin Jiang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-09-29 00:19

Reviewer performed review: 2025-10-07 09:03

Review time: 8 Days and 8 Hours

Content to be reviewed	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? No Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes Are the Key Words complete? Yes Is the content of the Introduction adequate? No
-------------------------------	--



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

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?

Not Applicable

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **No**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Not Applicable**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **Not Applicable**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Not Applicable**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Not Applicable**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **No**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **Yes**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **No**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers?
No



	Are additional experiments needed for the study? Yes Does the research scope comply with ethics? Yes
Scientific quality	Grade C (Good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade D (Fair)
Language quality	Grade C (Good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Major revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The title should not contain any abbreviations. Moreover, the term "SPEM" used in the title does not correspond to any previously defined abbreviation in the text.
2. Both the abstract and background sections begin with a focus on gastric cancer, which may confuse readers. While the authors may intend to establish a link between SPEM and gastric cancer, the central subject of this review should be SPEM itself. The current



presentation creates a logical inconsistency in the narrative flow.

3. What is "Spem"? The abbreviation of key terms must remain consistent throughout the manuscript. In several earlier sections, "Spem" appears frequently – is this not the same as "SPEM"? Uniform notation is essential for clarity and professionalism.

4. Overall, the article adopts a largely enumerative style of presentation without adequately synthesizing the cited literature. There is a lack of clear hierarchical structure and logical progression, which undermines the articulation of why SPEM deserves clinical attention.

5. Most critically, the conclusion exhibits significant flaws. Given the nature of this work as a review article, labeling it as an "analysis" is inappropriate – what specific analysis did the authors perform, and what original conclusions were drawn?

For instance, the current Conclusion states:

"Our analysis incorporates recent findings on the origins of SPEM cells as well as certain pathways (e.g., NF- κ B, YAP, STAT3, and Wnt/ β -catenin signaling cascades). The information that is now available indicates that SPEM is a state of precancerous lesions that eventually encourages gastric carcinogenesis, in addition to being the mucosa's adaptive repair response to injury. These compilations will offer a theoretical foundation for the early detection and treatment of stomach cancer as well as increase our understanding of the mechanisms underlying SPEM."

This passage merely compiles existing knowledge without presenting novel insights or critical synthesis. A review should summarize, evaluate, and contextualize existing research – not simply list findings. The use of the term "analysis" is misleading, as no original analytical work appears to have been conducted.