

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 34613

**Title:** High Yield Reproducible Rat Model Recapitulating Human Barrett's Carcinogenesis

**Reviewer's code:** 03529755

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-12

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for giving opportunity to me to review this article. I would like to congratulate all the authors for this study. I would like to accept this properly written article as it is.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 34613

**Title:** High Yield Reproducible Rat Model Recapitulating Human Barrett's Carcinogenesis

**Reviewer's code:** 03699916

**Reviewer's country:** Denmark

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-12

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Ms: ESPS Manuscript NO: 34613 Authors: Daisuke Matsui, Ashten N Omstead, Juliann E Kosovec, Yoshihiro Komatsu, Emily J. Lloyd, Hailey Raphael, Ronan J Kelly, Ali H Zaidi, Blair A Jobe Title: High Yield Reproducible Rat Model Recapitulating Human Barrett's Carcinogenesis GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a well-designed basic study. Authors in this study generated modified End-to-side esophagojejunostomy (EJ) rat model. Using this model, authors determine respective rates of carcinogenic development and gene expression levels of MUC2, CK19, and CK20. In order to better understand the underlying biology and prevent and treat esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC), the modified EJ model generated in the present study and the data obtained are important for understand disease progression spectrum from Barrett's esophagus to metastatic EAC. Therefore, the manuscript is good for the readership of WJG. SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Title and sub-title: The title and sub-title accurately reflect the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract: The description of aim,

material and methods, result and conclusion sections is fine. However, the number of animals in each time point should be indicated in the method section. Introduction: It is well written. Material and methods: Generally, this section is well written. Again, the number of animals in each time point should be indicated. I notice from figure 1 that the number of animals is different among different groups, why? Furthermore, the extent of each disease type in 200uM of tissue may differ with the marked H&E slide. How the authors can be sure that the enough lesion exists in the 200uM of tissue. Inhomogeneous lesions may affect the results of gene expression analysis Results: This section generally reflects the results obtained from the study clearly. Three comments are as following: 1, About the effective numbers of rats examined for study endpoints, is it true about non-operated (n=0)? 2, About the EAC, did you find any evidence grossly about EAC at any time points post-surgery? 3, In two animals with macro-metastases, did authors also find the macro-lesion of EAC in the surface of esophageal mucosa? It will be interesting to show the photos for such macro-metastases in the paper. Discussion: The discussion is well written. However, it should be good to provide some information about the overall incidence of EAC from other similar studies. References: The references are appropriate, relevant, and updated. Tables and figures: Figures are appropriately presented.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 34613

**Title:** High Yield Reproducible Rat Model Recapitulating Human Barrett's Carcinogenesis

**Reviewer's code:** 00036825

**Reviewer's country:** Hungary

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-12

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the surgical model do not meet the human pathology. In the model described the acid reflux is missing. The content of reflux remains unknown, the analysis is missing. Evaluation of pathophysiological processes provoking EAC are also missing. The terminology of dysplasia is confusing: " dysplastic squamous cell epithelium " is applied, while in BE the field of dysplasia is the glandular/intestinal type metaplasia.