PEER-REVIEW REPORT

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good			[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript reported that evaluation of the role of mesencephalic astrocyte-derived

neurotrophic factor (MANF) in hepatic lipid metabolism of in vitro and in vivo study. This paper has new information. However, there are some problems and flaws in presentation and discussion. I hope that my comments are very useful for the improvement of this research. Major comment (1) Discussion: Does MANF regulate lipid metabolism through SREBP -1 c? If so, please consider the relationship between MANF and SREBP. (2)Figure 3: In Lv-MANF+FFAs group, the content of cholesterol was decreased compared with Lv-GFP+FFAs group. However, no consideration has been given to lowering cholesterol. Please discuss the relationship between MANF and cholesterol levels. Minor comment (3) Animal experiment: Please write how many weeks you kept mice. (4) Oil red O staining: When I check the figure, I think other stains applied. Please describe the method exactly.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 52534

Title: MANF ameliorates steatosis in HepG2 cells by regulating hepatic lipid metabolism

Reviewer's code: 00227633

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-21 17:20

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-23 15:49

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author's purpose of the investigation is very interesting, also for scientists from

related research fields. I would recommend the suggestions described below: 1)   The title should be short and concise. According to recent studies that would favor future citations to the paper. What is really new in the paper? 2) Abstract   should   be   also quantitative as possible for rapid comparison with similar studies. It should be a mirror of the paper. Avoid imprecise terms such as decrease or increase (but how much?).   3)

The results are not properly described. The authors should first describe in a quantitative manner the data before jump to conclusions. Avoid imprecise terms such as lower, higher, decrease, (but how much?)….. The results should be as quantitative described as possible according to data figures inserted. Avoid jumping immediately to conclusions, rather describing the data first. 4) Discussion should be more assertive and concise and eventually be divided in sections with titles highlighting the major results.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good			[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

or a statistical analysis of the obtained data, the authors of the article used the t-test and

ANOVA followed by the Tukey test to compare variables between groups. These criteria can only be used with normal distribution. Did the authors check the type of distribution? In addition, a number of features can only be compared by nonparametric criteria. Such signs include relative indicators, indices. To such data, the authors include relative gene expression, Western blot data.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No