

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38689

Title: Amelioration of hepatotoxicity by bio-cleavable aminothiols chimeras of isoniazid: Design, synthesis, kinetics and pharmacological evaluation

Reviewer's code: 00036801

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-03-11

Date reviewed: 2018-03-16

Review time: 5 Days

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input 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

This manuscript is a basic paper showing that a prodrug made as a mix of isoniazide and n-acetylcysteine may be a good approach to reduce the isoniazide hepatotoxicity frequently observed in anti-tuberculosis treatment. Manuscript is well written and results are interesting. Several points should be clarified by authors to ameliorate the reading of the paper: 1 - Throughout the introduction and result sections, several abbreviations are used that have not been previously defined in the text (they can be defined later) as TEA, DCM, OPA, MGI, CMC. It would be good to have a list of abbreviations at the beginning of the article to facilitate reading. 2 - Was the histopathological analysis blind? How the authors guarantee that the histopathological analysis was unbiased? 3 - Authors describe results as mean and SD and analyze differences among groups using ANOVA test. Was data normality ascertained before

the analysis? How were analyzed values who didn't follow a normal distribution? 4 - A very great part of the text in the discussion section is about results or procedures. Discussion should be shorter and easy to read and centered in discuss the meaning of findings. Results description must appeared in result section and methodology descriptions should be remove from this section of the text.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38689

Title: Amelioration of hepatotoxicity by bio-cleavable aminothiols chimeras of isoniazid: Design, synthesis, kinetics and pharmacological evaluation

Reviewer's code: 00071178

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-03-11

Date reviewed: 2018-03-18

Review time: 7 Days

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The introduction section was too long. To me, it should be shortened. The article is written very irregularly. The sequence in the methodology section of the article must be changed. Because I tried to read ten times, but I had difficulty concentrating. Eight groups are specified, but it should be clearly stated how many rats are used in each group. Anova is never suitable for experimental work. A nonparametric method should be used in studies where the number of subjects is low or the results are not normally distributed. This study has a few problems in terms of statistical analysis methods. As a result, the world journal of gastroenterology is often read by clinicians. The articles written by pharmacologists should be written with the logic that can be understood by the clinicians. Because the clinician who reads this article will get out of this article?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38689

Title: Amelioration of hepatotoxicity by bio-cleavable aminothiols chimeras of isoniazid: Design, synthesis, kinetics and pharmacological evaluation

Reviewer's code: 00189256

Reviewer's country: Ukraine

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-03-11

Date reviewed: 2018-03-21

Review time: 10 Days

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You have prepared an article devoted to the actually problem of experimental medicine. The material is presented logically and correctly.