



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled **“Effects of permissive hypocaloric versus standard enteral feeding on gastrointestinal function and outcomes in acute phase of sepsis (Manuscript NO: 66447, Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology)”**. We appreciate our editor very much for your valuable and constructive comments on our manuscript! We are also pleased to know that our study is of general interest for the readers of **World Journal of Gastroenterology**. We have revised our manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments, made point-by-point responses, and detailed the changes. All changes were highlighted with **red color** in the text so that they may be easily identified. Hope these will make it more acceptable for publication.

Thank you very much for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Xin-Wei Mu



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Responses to Reviewers' comments

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 66447

Title: Effects of permissive hypocaloric versus standard enteral feeding on gastrointestinal function and outcomes in acute phase of sepsis

Reviewer's code: 02538689

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is very well designed to investigate the effects of enteral nutrition on intestinal mucosal barrier in adults with sepsis, specifically focusing on the goal enteral caloric intake. The results are striking. The clinical outcomes of the patients receiving different enteral intakes were the same, so longer duration of follow-up will be interesting to study.

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's approval. We look forward to work in collaboration with the reviewer about the following study in future.

Reviewer's code: 05382551

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The subject of the article is within the scope of the journal. It is well written and its reading is fluent. However, there are some aspects that can be improved:

1) Some lines of future work should be added to the conclusions.

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's suggestion. This clinical pilot study found that early moderate underfeeding (60% of goal requirement) could improve the intestinal barrier function and nutritional and inflammatory status without increasing the incidence of FI symptoms in sepsis. No difference in the clinical outcomes was found among the three groups of different enteral intakes. However, further large-scale clinical

prospective trails and animal studies were required to test our findings. Moreover, the effects of different protein intake on gastrointestinal function and outcomes should also be investigated in future work. We have added the descriptions in the Abstract and Conclusions sections of our manuscript.

2) In the introduction the state of the art of the domain of the article should be better contextualized. Is too short.

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's suggestion. We have added the following descriptions in the Introduction section of our manuscript: "Among the organ dysfunction caused by sepsis, intestinal tract is one of the most vulnerable organs. Accompanying by sepsis, intestinal epithelial cell damaged, mucosal permeability increased, intestinal flora translocated, and then further intestinal original infection developed. Therefore, acute intestinal barrier injury and systemic infection are a vicious cycle in critical diseases, especially in sepsis. Accordingly, it is necessary to explore an optimal goal of enteral feeding to improve the acute intestinal injury of sepsis. In this study, we investigated the effects of different goal caloric requirements (30%, 60%, and 100%) of EN on the gastrointestinal (including intestinal mucosal barrier) function in the acute phase of sepsis."

Responses to Editorial Office's comments

(1) Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a clinical trials study of the effects of permissive hypocaloric versus standard enteral feeding on gastrointestinal function and outcomes in acute phase of sepsis. The topic is within the scope of the WJG.

(1) Classification: Grade A and Grade C;

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The study is very well designed to investigate the effects of enteral nutrition on intestinal mucosal barrier in adults with sepsis. It is well written. However, some aspects should be improved. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

(3) Format: There are 3 tables and 5 figures.

(4) References: A total of 38 references are cited, including 17 references published in the last 3 years;

(5) Self-cited references: There are 5 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations that are closely related to the topic of the manuscript, and remove other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated;

Responses: Thanks very much for the editor's suggestions. We have removed 2 improper self-cited references. Now, there are only 3 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates is less than 10% (8.33%, 3/36).

(6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate,

the Clinical Trial Registration Statement, the CONSORT 2010 Statement and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by 2 grants. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG.

5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words;

Responses: Thanks very much for the editor's suggestion. We have modified the title to "Effects of permissive hypocaloric versus standard enteral feeding on gastrointestinal function and outcomes in sepsis" (15 words).

(2) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

Responses: Thanks very much for the editor's suggestion. We have uploaded the approved grant application forms.

(3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please 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;

Responses: Thanks very much for the editor's suggestions. We have provided the original figures using PowerPoint.

(4) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout;

Responses: Thanks very much for the editor's suggestions. We have provided the

PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and listed all authors of the references.

(5) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Responses: Thanks very much for the editor’s suggestion. We have added the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Responses: Thanks very much for the Company editor-in-chief’s comments. We have revised our manuscript according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.