

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 2557

**Title:** Effects of rhein on intestinal epithelial tight junction proteins in rats with IgA nephropathy

**Reviewer code:** 00225325

**Science editor:** Huang, Xin-Zhen

**Date sent for review:** 2013-03-01 11:53

**Date reviewed:** 2013-03-22 15:37

| 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)            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)            |   | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In their manuscript Peng et al studied the effect of rhein treatment on the intestinal epithelial tight junctions in a rat model of IgG nephropathy. Major comments: - it is not clear how representative the images in Figure 1 are. How many animals were analyzed in the TEM study? The same applies to the experiments in Figures 2 and 3. - in Figure 3 the difference in ZO1 signal is not clear. The figure should be improved, possibly adding co-staining with a membrane marker. - Data shown in Tables 1 and 2 (signal intensity for RT-PCR or WB data) should be expressed relative to the respective normalizer (ie actin). It is not clear if this was done. Also, both in Figure 4 and 5 some signals look at saturation, making it difficult to assess any difference between the samples. Could the authors show RT-PCR for actin at less cycles (Figure 4) and a less saturated exposure for actin in WB analysis (Figure 5)? The same applies to occluding signal in Figure 5. The authors state that occluding protein is higher in samples from rats treated with rhein but the difference between lanes2 (IgA) and 3 (rhein-treated) is not evident. Finally, the number of animals that was used for RT-PCR and WB experiments should be clearly indicated. Minor comments: - The English language should be improved throughout the manuscript. - As a general comment, it is not clear what p values in Tables 1-3 refer to. This should be better explained, for instance by clearly indicating the groups that are being compared.