



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

Reviewer's code: 03415937

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-01-10 18:45

Date reviewed: 2016-01-21 08:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Figures need to be arranged in panels.

Reply:

We have arranged the figures in panels as suggested.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

Reviewer's code: 03262677

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-01-10 18:45

Date reviewed: 2016-01-21 09:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim of the present study was to evaluate simultaneous administration of immunosuppressant drug, everolimus, and a human growth hormone on intestinal wound healing in a rat model. The authors demonstrated that the administration of everolimus in conjunction with hGH ameliorate the negative effect of everolimus on intestinal wound healing by reducing inflammation and increasing collagen deposits. The authors speculate this may act via the mTOR pathway. However, further research is warranted. The manuscript is well written, clear and concise. The research has significant application for immunosuppressant medications in patients undergoing solid organ transplantation. Minor comment. Fig. 5 b, the variation in the 3 groups suggest that there are no significant differences between the groups but the authors have reported a significant difference. Please check and clarify.

Reply:

Thank you very much for your comments.

Regarding your minor comment on Fig. 5b: We agree that the variations suggest that there is no significant difference between the three groups. We therefore reviewed the numeric data and the statistical tests which came to the previous result that there is a difference. This might be due to the reason that the numeric data show a great basic variation per se. However, the zymograms (panel a) obviously indicate the significant differences between the everolimus group and the placebo and hGH groups by a reduced proteolytic activity in the placebo and hGH groups.