

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51985

**Title:** Pentadecapeptide BPC 157 resolves Pringle maneuver in rats, both ischemia and reperfusion

**Reviewer's code:** 00053659

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** Croatia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-10-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-10-28 10:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-10-28 11:18

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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**

Kolovrat et al. investigated rat models that Pentadecapeptide BPC 157 attenuated organ injuries after Pringle maneuver. Although clinical impact of the Pringle maneuver is no longer important as a decade ago, the results seem to be promising with meticulous experiment. However, the manuscript seems to be informal, and it needs native editing with formal certification. In fact, the English editing certificate is invalid due to lack of date. Figure legend is too premature and complex to understand them. They need more detail descriptions. Otherwise, it is interesting. Fig. 3 needs some explanations for the labels. What do S, Bug, and Bng stand for? Fig.4 needs some explanations too. What does each column stand for?

## **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 Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51985

**Title:** Pentadecapeptide BPC 157 resolves Pringle maneuver in rats, both ischemia and reperfusion

**Reviewer's code:** 02540650

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Author's country:** Croatia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-10-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-11-03 08:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-11-03 08:48

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 checked="" 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 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



**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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This topic although is frequently studied, however is well designed, informative and properly designated, some points are needed to be clarified: 1. Why you specifically use BPC 157 however many better drugs are available? 2. All figures are images and some of them with very bad resolution and small font 3. Discussion is very long and introduction is long, both need to be more concise. 4. Many spelling and grammar mistakes are needed to be corrected

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

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

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 51985

**Title:** Pentadecapeptide BPC 157 resolves Pringle maneuver in rats, both ischemia and reperfusion

**Reviewer's code:** 00053659

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** Croatia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-10-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-19 12:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-19 13:06

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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



**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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Kolovrat et al. revised their manuscript, but it is very hard to evaluate it. Because there is no figure number and no indicator for each photo. The paper is too crude to read for the review. The figs need to focus on what you would like to present. Other figs should be supplement figs.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

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