

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24003

**Title:** Sieving characteristics of cytokine- and peroxide-induced epithelial barrier leak: Inhibition by berberine

**Reviewer's code:** 02941672

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-02 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-08 16:11

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The followings are comments for "Sieving characteristics of cytokine- and peroxide-induced epithelial barrier leak: inhibition by berberine". The paper is well written, but I have some comments for further improvement. 1. As reviewer 1 mentioned, Figure 1 and 2 can be combined because some parts of data appear duplicate. 2. In Exposure to TEN and IFN experiment, dosage of IFN should be fixed not between 100 to 200ng. 3. In Exposure to TEN, IFN and IL1 $\beta$  experiment, data of exposure to IL1 $\beta$  alone is lacking. In addition, post-confluent date (21-day not 7-day) and IFN dosage (150ng/ml not 200g/ml) are different from exposure to TEN and IFN experiment. Why? 4. In Exposure to Cytomix and Hydrogen Peroxide experiment, two different dates (7 and 21-day post-confluent) are presented. Which is the date for Figure 5? And, how about Mannitol or Lactulose leak in same condition? 5. In Transepithelial Leak of EGF experiment, the dosage of TNF (50ng/ml not 200ng/ml), IFN (100ng/ml not 200ng/ml) and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (1mM not 2mM) and exposure time for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (3hr not 5hr) are different from previous experiment. Why? 6. What is the definition of apoptosis in Figure 6? Nucleus concentration and fragmentation cannot be found.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24003

**Title:** Sieving characteristics of cytokine- and peroxide-induced epithelial barrier leak: Inhibition by berberine

**Reviewer's code:** 03474080

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-02 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-16 19:44

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written, but there are some uncertainties that are needed to be clarified. In the exposure to cytomix experiment, the group of IL1 $\beta$  exposure alone is lacking. there are inconsistency between some doses. These issues must be explained or corrected.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24003

**Title:** Sieving characteristics of cytokine- and peroxide-induced epithelial barrier leak: Inhibition by berberine

**Reviewer's code:** 02821831

**Reviewer's country:** Algeria

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-02 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-13 17:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting study. The authors should clarify their objectives in the introduction