

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12685

Title: Degradation of intestinal mRNA: A matter of treatment

Reviewer code: 00503442

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2014-07-22 10:08

Date reviewed: 2014-08-26 21:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with great attention the manuscript entitled "Degradation of intestinal mRNA: A matter of treatment" by Sabine Heumüller-Klu et al. Although in my downloaded copy there are many revisions, the manuscript is interesting, well written and well done. The field of investigation is timely and interesting for many investigators. Some orthographical and grammatical errors have been found throughout the manuscript.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12685

Title: Degradation of intestinal mRNA: A matter of treatment

Reviewer code: 00535896

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2014-07-22 10:08

Date reviewed: 2014-08-23 21:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The current manuscript presents interesting experimental data regarding an important problem. The need of excellent RNA quality seems to be very essential to obtain good data. The paper is well structured and results are presented in a coherent manner. The presentation e.g. that human RNA degrades faster than the one derived from rat and that RNA from the muscle layer remains much longer stable than RNA from the submucosal/mucosal layer etc. is well shown in the result part and also well discussed. The Discussion part is very precise. The results of the study are well discussed, so that practical aspect of the data is highlighted. Maybe the title of the Manuscript could be more significant.