

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7048

**Title:** Intravenous Infusion of Mesenteric Lymph of Severe Intraperitoneal Infection Causes Lung Injury

**Reviewer code:** 01434943

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-02 19:53

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-26 09:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A simple but important rat study of the role of mesenteric lymph in lung infection. English grammar requires major attention throughout. **TITLE:** Suggest: 'mesenteric lymph following severe intraperitoneal...' **ABSTRACT:** p-values should be included (or other indicators of magnitude; %changes etc). **INTRODUCTION:** Requires expanding. There are very few references. Goal from the experimental design should be incorporated. **METHODS:** Described well. It is stated that data are mean+/-SD but the figures show mean +/-SEM. **RESULTS:** The SEMs are amazingly small for an n of only 10. This would indicate almost identical results from rats within a treatment group. Raw data from one study should be shown in any response to confirm the lack of variability (especially figures 1 and 4). **DISCUSSION:** Generally appropriate although a rewrite is required focussing on English grammar in order to make the section more understandable for critique. **REFERENCES:** A little under-referenced.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7048

**Title:** Intravenous Infusion of Mesenteric Lymph of Severe Intraperitoneal Infection Causes Lung Injury

**Reviewer code:** 01569271

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-02 19:53

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-04 22:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The findings of the study are significant, and may have favorable clinical outcomes. However, the following need detailed inclusion: 1. the total number of rats in the study group and the control group needs mentioning in the material and methods section. It has only been mentioned as 10 in each group in the legends of the figures. 2. It does not suffice to say that a result is significant to the p value of  $<0.05$ . Exact tables of the values should be added to the paper. The mean values  $\pm$  SD, referred to, need to be furnished. 3. Discussion tends to be repetitive on certain points. 4. The last paragraph in the discussion needs to be rewritten in correct English. 5. More of recent publications on this topic should be included in the discussion, e.g. Deitch EA, publication of 2012. 5. Grammatical errors need editing.