

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13767

Title: The therapeutic effect of Qingyi decoction in intestinal barrier injury in rats with severe acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 00158184

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-01 12:09

Date reviewed: 2014-10-04 01:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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"/> 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It was a pleasure to read such a well written article like yours.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13767

Title: The therapeutic effect of Qingyi decoction in intestinal barrier injury in rats with severe acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 02440222

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-01 12:09

Date reviewed: 2014-09-28 20:05

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. There are several grammar errors and vocabulary misuses in this article. Maybe it will be better understood when modified carefully. 2. There can be a better design for some experiments referred in this article, like when you set up the SAP animal model using rats, you can inject the solvent as a control rather than “only had their pancreas marginally rotated prior to closing the abdomen”. Also, you can use real-time PCR to test the transcriptional level of interesting genes rather than compare the grey value. 3. Several results in this article is kind of confusing. Like the pictures in figure2, it seems that figure-2E has a different magnification times than others. Also, Is there any mistakes in the annotation of Figue3-C? And as it comes to the “Pancreas and intestinal histopathology” results, why don’t you show the result in QYT group, which I think is quite important in this project?

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13767

Title: The therapeutic effect of Qingyi decoction in intestinal barrier injury in rats with severe acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 00034432

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-01 12:09

Date reviewed: 2014-09-30 14:17

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 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 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The major bias of the study is that the drug has been administered before the induction of acute pancreatitis whereas the other drugs were correctly administered after the induction. The response to herbal treatment is slow and the conclusions of the paper should take into account this aspect. There are several typos: for example method instead of method.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13767

Title: The therapeutic effect of Qingyi decoction in intestinal barrier injury in rats with severe acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 02445032

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-01 12:09

Date reviewed: 2014-10-09 03:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

GENERAL COMMENTS **NOVELTY/INNOVATION & THE IMPORTANCE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MANUSCRIPT CONTENTS** Severe acute pancreatitis (SAP) remains a serious clinical problem with significant morbidity and mortality. Studies suggest that loss of the gut barrier function is instrumental in the local and systemic infectious complications associated with a severe course of the disease. Improvement of intestinal barrier function may be a useful strategy to alleviate the severity and possibility of infectious complication in SAP. The present study aimed to examine the possible involvement of sPLA2 in the intestinal barrier damage process in SAP, and the intervening role of Qingyi decoction and verapamil in comparison with dexamethasone as a reference treatment. Qingyi decoction is a traditional Chinese prescription in treatment of SAP. Overall, I find this manuscript interesting and important to the field. There are, however, some queries, suggestions and revisions to make that, in my opinion, would increase the quality of the publication (see below).

READABILITY OF THE MANUSCRIPT Language evaluation: Grade B: Minor language polishing Introduction - Page 3, lines 6-7: "is a damage factor whose function is dependent on intracellular calcium ion concentration" ?? Material and methods - Page 6, 2nd paragraph (Intestinal epithelial cell apoptosis detection): Rewrite. - Page 7 (Statistical analyses): "were assessed by ANOVA" ?? Results - Page 7, lines 6 from the bottom: structure ??

SPECIFIC COMMENTS Introduction Page 3, line 13 from the bottom: the authors cite a previous study of

their group as reference no. 7. Is this correct? It seems like it should be referenced as no. 6.

Materials and Methods The authors may include (either in this section or perhaps as supplementary on line information) details about the composition of Qingyi decoction: ingredients (roots and herbs used) and amounts of each one. It would be also useful to know the proportion of total crude ingredient/volume (i.e. 1 g/ml).

Results - The manuscript informs only about mean comparisons between SAP vs control, and between individual treatments vs. SAP. Have the authors compared the treatment groups - decoction, verapamil, dexamethasone- among them? This information should be valuable for the readership.

- Serum TNF- α data in Table 1 seem to be expressed in ng/L, while in the Materials and Methods section it is read that "TNF- α levels are expressed in ng/mL". Which statement is correct?

- If serum TNF- α data in Table 1 are indeed expressed in ng/L, the values are very different to those reported by the authors in another study (Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine 7: 565-572, 2014) by using the same model of SAP in Sprague-Dawley rats. Even though some aspects of the treatment protocol might be slightly different, at least TNF- α values in control (sham) rats should be more alike. It is true that the analytical methods for measuring TNF- α are different (radioimmunoassay vs. enzyme-linked immune sorbent assay), but I am not sure that this alone can explain the marked differences between the values reported here and in the above-mentioned article.

- Figure 1 legend: Perhaps the authors can rephrase the text in order to avoid multiple repetitions of "pancreas tissue" and "intestinal tissues".

- Figures 3C and 4C. Using +/- symbols in the X axis is confusing. I think it would be clearer if the authors simply include in the Figure legend information about which pattern (shading) corresponds to each group.

Other In this study, Qingyi decoction is given orally to rats. Have the authors information about how well tolerated is this decoction when given orally to SAP patients? Perhaps a comment about this aspect could be included somewhere in the manuscript.