

ESPS Peer-review Report**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 11786**Title:** Delayed Ethanol Elimination and Enhanced Susceptibility to Ethanol-Induced Hepatosteatosis after Liver Resection**Reviewer code:** 02903629**Science editor:** Yuan Qi**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-04 20:21**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-13 13:02

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 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) MATERIALS AND METHODS (Page 7) : "Eight-week-old male Wistar rats from Charles River Japan, Inc. (Tokyo) were randomly assigned to the PH or the Sham-operation (Sham) groups." This section seems to be rather opaque, the author should explain this in further detail, and how the randomized groups were conducted. 2) The study sample size appears to be rather arbitrary, which is also the biggest method problem. Is there theory-guided rationale for such a sample size? The author should provide a description about sample size calculation. In the current situation, four groups were compared, and the largest sample size is only ten, which is quite far from the requirements of statistical analysis. Such a small sample size makes the whole analysis results quite unreliable. 3) Similar to point 2, the sample size is so small. The parametric statistical methods used in the manuscript are very inappropriate including the descriptive statistics, (means \pm standard deviations). The non-parametric statistical should be conducted, and the median and quartile should be used to describe the results. 4) MATERIALS AND METHODS (Page 8) According to the author's statement, there are 6 sham operation and 30 PH. "Two PH rats, died from PH operation, were discarded from the preliminary examination." The total should be 34. But in the Abstract part, the author mentioned "Pair-feeding was performed with a controlled diet or with a 5-g/dL ethanol liquid diet for 28 days in 35 age-matched male Wistar rats with a one-week recovery after undergoing a sham operation or PH. Please explain this. 5) Results (P13): According to the material and methods, "The groups were divided as follows:.....ethanol liquid diet (PH-ethanol, n = 10)." Some indicators should be compared among four groups before PH or sham. How can you be sure that the baseline



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

characteristics are consistency among four groups? 6) Although the manuscript provided a number of figures to show the results, some Tables with specific value should be used, particularly in the Figure 7. The corresponding statistic results should be presented. 7) AST (aspartate amino transferase) is also an indicators of live function, why does the author only use the ALT? Please explain this. 8) In the manuscript the author should use the hepatic steatosis instead of hepatosteatosi, and the former is more common. 9) The Figure legends is too long. The important results should be presented in the form of text.