

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 37096

**Title:** Enteral nutrition combined with glutamine promotes recovery from ileal pouch-anal anastomosis in rats

**Reviewer's code:** 03479673

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-15

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-18

**Review time:** 2 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

First of all, need to congratulate you for carrying out this research with a good design. While reviewing this article, it was fun though; my job is to find the deficiencies before it is presented to readers, so to make it more appealing and authentic. So here they are, 1) There are many grammatical mistakes, please rectify them all. There are also places where two words are not separated by space, please check them all. 2) Provide full names of abbreviations used for first time i.e., PBS (Phosphate Buffered Solution) etc. 3) Use word 'anaesthesia' instead of 'anaesthetic' while mentioning how tissue was acquired from rats for histology. 4) Use word 'anal canal or anus' instead of 'anal' in discussion part. 5) Give details of composition of standard rat chow used in this research, and if possible give glutamine content too. 6) In methods, please explain how the sample size was counted and how you decided the number 8 for each group. 7) Mention when



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://** [www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

the rat chow was started in control group, as EN and IN group intake was started on day 3. 8) In results section, use different sentences to show significant difference between two groups, stating results for all three of them in single sentence may create some confusion while reading. 9) In my opinion, rather than directly stating that 'Our results provide experimental evidence to support glutamine supplementation of EN for UC patients undergoing IPAA.', provide basic evidence and simultaneously suggest for human studies by stating 'our results provide some evidence for usefulness of glutamine enriched enteral nutrition in patients undergoing IPAA; though human studies for same are recommended.' Thank you very much.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 37096

**Title:** Enteral nutrition combined with glutamine promotes recovery from ileal pouch-anal anastomosis in rats

**Reviewer's code:** 02954419

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-15

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-19

**Review time:** 3 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

Xu et al present their interesting and relevant findings on the efficacy of enteral nutrition and glutamine in improving nutritional status after an ileal pouch-anal anastomosis procedure in male Sprague-Dawley rats. The title notes that enteral nutrition and glutamine "promotes recovery FROM ileal pouch-anal anastomosis". It probably meant "recovery AFTER ileal pouch-anal anastomosis". Please provide some quantitative results in the Abstract. The Abstract should specify the "Histopathological score" used. The Abstract would benefit from some information about the weight changes across the 3 treatment arms. Using total protein, albumin, prealbumin, and transferrin as surrogate markers of nutritional status is considered inaccurate by nutrition experts. The changes in weight are more convincing markers of the nutritional benefits of EN and IN, although the current presentation is fine as is. The clinical significance of the laboratory



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

differences (TP, ALB, PA, TF) is unclear. Are there any data from other studies to demonstrate that the small variations in these measures confer any clinically meaningful changes in outcomes? If not, then it may be premature to state that glutamine supplementation should necessarily be done for UC patients undergoing an IPAA. So, instead of saying that the “results provide experimental evidence to support glutamine supplementation”, it may be better to say that it “suggests a benefit of glutamine supplementation” (or something similar). It is also too strong to say that “EN combined with glutamine can effectively improve the nutritional status”. This language should be slightly attenuated.