BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology
Manuscript NO: 32970
Title: Rectification of oxygen transfer through the rat colonic epithelium
Reviewer's code: 00058696
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2017-02-08
Date reviewed: 2017-02-16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This new manuscript has been carefully examined. Major comments include: 1) All results provided in the Abstract should be presented in the Results Section. Specifically: the authors should describe in the Results Section the r values for comparison of short-circuit current to both total oxygen consumption and oxygen consumption in the mucosal hemichamber. 2) These linear correlation relationships were however very modest with R-squared of 0.343 and 0.323, respectively. These two linear regression graphs are not presently shown, and so the readers do not know whether the R-values are simply related to the presence of single outliers outside the data points. 3) The majority of readers of this journal will not have been trained in electrophysiology. The authors must therefore clearly describe and then define what they are referring to when using the phrase "rectifying behavior". 4)The Introduction reads more as being a "Summary" rather than outlining background information. There is no hypothesis provided by the authors in the Introduction. There are no aims provided by the authors in the Introduction. 5) In Materials and Methods, were the rats fed ad libitum?

6) Serum Aldosterone Determination: serum was extracted and "frozen" (not freezed).
7) In conclusion, page 13: sigmoid colon epithelium "in a rat model". The authors should also consider indicating the animal model in their title.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology
Manuscript NO: 32970
Title: Rectification of oxygen transfer through the rat colonic epithelium
Reviewer's code: 02441737
Reviewer's country: Mexico
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2017-02-08
Date reviewed: 2017-02-18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the manuscript: Rectifying nature of oxygen transfer through the colonic epithelium. From the author: Fernando D. Saraví, Graciela E. Carra, Daniel A. Matus, Jorge E. Ibá?ez. The aim of this study was to assess whether higher sensitivity of colonic epithelium to hypoxia at the serosal side is associated with oxygen transfer asymmetry. Comments: It is a very well design study and the issue is elegantly developed. Title: the title is adequate Abstract: This abstract comprehend 266 words. Introduction: The introduction is appropriate and allows a proper understanding of the problem of study. Only it is advisable to mention some figures in relation to the clinical application of this study. Material and methods: It is necessary that the author describe the following aspects: 1. Why do they have different sample size in each study group? 2. Which formula, do the use to determine the sample size and to describe the mean and standard deviation used to determine de sample size? 3. If the authors determined the normal distribution of each studied variable? 4. If in the design, the authors have more than one study group, to explain the reasons which they do not use ANOVA and

post-hoc statistical analysis. Results: It is advisable that researchers present the significant differences in the bars of the Figure 1.