

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82150

Title: Exploring choices of early nutritional support for patients with sepsis based on changes in intestinal microecology

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03764245

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-20 10:11

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-20 10:24

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study proves that total enteral nutrition is a good modality of early nutrition support for sepsis.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82150

Title: Exploring choices of early nutritional support for patients with sepsis based on changes in intestinal microecology

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06250974

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Instructor, Staff Physician, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-27 02:13

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-02 15:02

Review time: 6 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work. This manuscript is a randomized clinical trial aimed at comparing the mode of early nutrition support as three different modalities of nutrition support: total enteral nutrition (TEN group), total parenteral nutrition (TPN group), and supplemental parenteral nutrition (SPN group) for sepsis patients from the perspective of intestinal microecology. Detailed comments about this study are as follows: -Please provide the information about the missing data, if it occurred in this study, and how to deal with it. -There is a well-organized discussion. -In the discussion, please correct the word “improveme” in the phrase “early TEN supports can improveme gut microbiota.” -In the legend of Figure 1, please correct the word “bacteial”. -In Figure 3, please reconsider changing the color code between the group as the author mentioned in the legend of Figure 3. Red as before nutrition support and blue as after nutrition support are used in Figure 1, Appendix Figure 1, and Appendix Figure 2. However, blue as before and red as after nutrition support are alternately used in Figure 3, which might confuse the reader. Also, please reconsider changing the color code: red as before nutrition support and blue as after nutrition



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

support in Figure 4. -In the result, the authors reported, "Comparison of genus and OTU level in gut microbiota composition using Mann-Whitney U-test showed that some gut bacteria changed significantly in the three groups after 5 days ..." However, Mann-Whitney U-test is a statistical analysis to compare two groups in general rather than among three groups, as the authors mentioned. Please reconsider using the appropriate statistics. -As the author mentioned, "... this study is limited with the small sample size ..." Please provide the study size estimation in the method section.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82150

Title: Exploring choices of early nutritional support for patients with sepsis based on changes in intestinal microecology

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05506329

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-30 10:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-03 02:44

Review time: 3 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nicely written article. Please mention how sample size was determined? please provide some detail on how initial 30 patients were enrolled (sampling method), how they were randomized. looks like patients were enrolled at various time, so please provide more detail on how exactly the patient were selected for various mode of nutrition. Please mention if other patient factors were considered besides randomization, for selection of mode of nutrition.