

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51491

Title: Abdominal paracentesis drainage ameliorates myocardial injury in severe experimental pancreatitis rats through suppressing HMGB1-mediated oxidative stress

Reviewer's code: 03647305

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director, Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-05 19:51

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-06 01:18

Review time: 5 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

Excellent work, congrats :)

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51491

Title: Abdominal paracentesis drainage ameliorates myocardial injury in severe experimental pancreatitis rats through suppressing HMGB1-mediated oxidative stress

Reviewer's code: 00227375

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's country: Japan

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-02 10:21

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-07 10:36

Review time: 5 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript about the effects of abdominal paracentesis drainage (APD) on severe acute pancreatitis (SAP)-associated cardiac injury. APD treatment improved cardiac morphological changes, inhibited cardiac dysfunction, decrease cardiac enzymes, and reduced cardiomyocyte apoptosis. In addition, APD significantly decreased serum level of high mobility group box (HMGB) 1. The authors have demonstrated that APD treatment could exert protective effects on SAP-associated cardiac injury through suppression HMGB1-mediated oxidative stress. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51491

Title: Abdominal paracentesis drainage ameliorates myocardial injury in severe experimental pancreatitis rats through suppressing HMGB1-mediated oxidative stress

Reviewer's code: 02446694

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, FAHA, MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's country: Japan

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-07 19:16

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-14 00:23

Review time: 6 Days and 5 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated the preventing effect of abdominal paracentesis drainage (APD) on myocardial injury in severe experimental pancreatitis. They showed that APD can improve cardiac dysfunction including the histopathological changes, increase in cardiac enzyme, hemodynamics, ultrasonographic findings, oxidative stress, apoptosis, pancreatic injury, and inflammation. They concluded that APD treatment can exert cardioprotective effects on severe acute pancreatitis (SAP)-associated cardiac injury. The results of present study seem to be superior, however, there are two major problems. #1 In the present study, there are many statistical significances between SAP group and SAP+APD group (n = 6 in each arm). As for me, I cannot accept these results without any questions. The authors should provide some supplemental information regarding their results. #2 To my knowledge, I have not experienced any patients with SAP-associated cardiac dysfunction. In addition, APD is not the standard therapy for acute pancreatitis. Thus, the authors should mention the clinical implications in the "Discussion" section.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51491

Title: Abdominal paracentesis drainage ameliorates myocardial injury in severe experimental pancreatitis rats through suppressing HMGB1-mediated oxidative stress

Reviewer's code: 02951945

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's country: United States

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-09-26 22:02

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-18 17:13

Review time: 21 Days and 19 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abdominal paracentesis drainage ameliorates myocardial injury in severe experimental pancreatitis rats through suppressing HMGB1-mediated oxidative stress Manuscript ID: 51491 Peer review 1 Title. Proper 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? • Please mention the full word of SACI prior to the acronym. • Results should not contain the discussion or hypothesis as the sentence “These data suggest that APD treatment can exert, which may be a novel mechanism behind the effectiveness of APD on SAP patients.” • The results regarding PAAF should be added. 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? • Keywords were not mentioned in the manuscript. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? • Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? • Randomized experiment is good. • The histopathologists and echo readers are blinded to groups of animal. • The experiment of mild acute pancreatitis (MAP): Why do you use MAP model in this experiment? Is the objective of this study focused on severe acute pancreatitis? • The experiment of mild acute pancreatitis (MAP): Is ‘three groups of six’ correct? It is unclear what it means. The detail of 6 groups were mentioned in the sentence after this so is it 3 or 6 groups? It was mentioned that there were 36 rats for this experiment. • Please add the significance of each Nox: Nox-2 and -4. • Please add details of histological scores (referred to Figure 6B). 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? • Yes • This study reports the novel finding of treatment for SAP in animal model in regards to cardiac parameters. The study in human in these cardiac outcomes is warranted to clarify the benefit in our patients. • Can you discuss why LVEDD is not different between SAP and SAP+APD groups? • Do you have the data on death of rats in groups of with and without APD? 7



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? • Please add references to the sentences containing "our previous studies". What are those studies? • Please add strengths and limitations of this study. • What is the future direction? 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? • Magnification detail needs to be fixed. 100x or x100? • Good quality of images 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? • They use the proper biostatistical methods. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? • Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? • Several sentences in Discussion referring to 'our previous studies' need references. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? • Minor language edit is required. • Typos in Discussion 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to

the appropriate research methods and reporting? • Yes, they used ARRIVE guideline.

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? • The experimental procedures were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at the Chengdu Military General Hospital and were conducted in accordance with the established International Guiding Principles for Animal Research.

Specific comments to authors • This study is very interesting since they report novel findings about cardiac injury. Previous studies demonstrated the effect of APD on systemic inflammatory response and other organ injuries. • All outcomes and parameters were explored extensively to cover cardiac-related issues. • Methods of experiments were thoroughly described.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No