

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29708

**Title:** Mitochondrial Carnitine Palmitoyl Transferase-II Inactivity Aggravates Lipid Accumulation in Rat Hepatocarcinogenesis

**Reviewer's code:** 03538105

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-28 21:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-06 06:24

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

A well organized study with clear aim and methodology. But there are several spelling mistakes and the discussion lacks a clear flow of ideas.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29708

**Title:** Mitochondrial Carnitine Palmitoyl Transferase-II Inactivity Aggravates Lipid Accumulation in Rat Hepatocarcinogenesis

**Reviewer's code:** 00364584

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-28 21:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-08 00:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

In this paper the authors showed that CPT-II level is decreased in rats fed with HFD or HFD+2-FAA and hypothesized that downregulation of CPT-II might result in lipid accumulation. This is a well-designed study with large sample size. The results are clear and convincing. However, it is not clear whether CPT-II downregulation is a cause or consequence of lipid overload in the diet. What happens to CPT-I? The paper has numerous typo and grammatical mistakes which need to be corrected.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29708

**Title:** Mitochondrial Carnitine Palmitoyl Transferase-II Inactivity Aggravates Lipid Accumulation in Rat Hepatocarcinogenesis

**Reviewer's code:** 01235974

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-28 21:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-11 03:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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 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

This interesting manuscript reports studies of the effects of high fat diet feeding and chemical induction of hepatocarcinogenesis on mitochondrial carnitine palmitoyl transferase-II (CPT-II) levels within the livers of rats. The authors maintain that their data suggest that diminished CPT-II levels accompanied by increased hepatic lipid accumulation damages liver cells and promotes the malignant transformation of hepatocytes. This conclusion is not established by the authors' data. Rather, diminished levels of hepatic CPT-II levels are associated with high fat diet feeding or following induction of hepatocarcinogenesis, but no data are presented that diminished CPT-II levels promote malignant transformation. The authors' data do not establish a casual relationship, simply an association. The manuscript has as a substantial general weakness. Specifically, a failure to adequately describe the experiments and data. The text does not allow a reader to understand what the authors have actually done and/or measured. Thus, in many instances the authors' data cannot be interpreted. For instance, Figures 1, 2 and 3 present data at "at early stage", "at interim stage" and "at later stage". What specifically are these stages? Do these stages reflect some time interval

following initiation onto the high fat diet or after administration of the carcinogen? Or are the stages established by some histological parameter? For data presented in Figures 1, 2 and 3 are stages identical by week for all of these diets...for instance, all data are for 4 or 6 weeks after carcinogen administration for all 3 figures? The text indicates that the control rats were fed a "normal" diet and 75% of the normal diet was used in formulating the remainder of the diets. What is this "normal" diet? What is 10% yolk? Yolk from chicken eggs...containing how much cholesterol? Was the normal diet a chow diet or a purified diet? And, what was the level fat in this diet? Without more information being provided regarding the compositions of all of the diets employed by the authors, it will be impossible for others to repeat this work. The text seems to suggest that 1 rat from each group was sacrificed at 2 week intervals throughout the conduct of the study. Yet, the bar graphs in Figures 2, 3 and 4 contain error bars which the text indicates reflect standard deviations. If 1 rat per group was sacrificed per two weeks, were data combined over an interval of multiple weeks to allow for standard deviations to be calculated? Or were simply replicate measures of a parameter made for one liver, with the standard deviation representing the agreement of these measures, providing no insight into differences across different experimental animals? If these measures reflect parameters measured for 1 rat per group, this is insufficient to allow for strong conclusions to be drawn regarding the biology since this is not speaking to biologic/experimental variability. This problem with clarity is compounded in that, in many places in the manuscript, the authors' English usage is not the best. Although the text of the manuscript is generally understandable, the authors' meanings in places are often not fully clear. For instance, the first sentence in the Materials and Methods under "Pathological examination" reads "Rat liver tissues were fixed by 10% (v/v) buffered formalin, and then dehydrated, transparent, dipped wax, embedded, sliced made of the paraffin sections." One can guess at what the authors actually did but this sentence very poorly conveys this. In places in the text the authors state that livers were "dyed" with oil red O while in other places the authors correctly refer to "staining" with oil red O. These sorts of small but repeated English usage problems detract from the authors' work and the manuscript. The manuscript needs to be very carefully edited for word usage and grammar.