

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2555

Title: Effect of amitriptyline on gastrointestinal function and brain-gut peptide: a double-blind trial

Reviewer code: 00036641

Science editor: Huang, Xin-Zhen

Date sent for review: 2013-03-01 11:39

Date reviewed: 2013-03-10 15:16

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

This manuscript titled “Effect of amitriptyline on gastrointestinal function and brain-gut peptide: a double-blind trial” has many troublesome points that must be clarified. Major: 1. I could not follow this manuscript due to deficiency of enough explanation for the method. Definitely, it needs correction of English by native speaker. 2. The brief review (about the definition and the function) of brain-gut peptide is needed in the Introduction section. 3. The dose of amitriptyline and the method of its administration were shortly described in abstract. However, these contents are not shown in materials and methods section. The full description is necessary. 4. The adverse effect of drug should be described and we need information of whether any person was dropped out due to its adverse effect. 5. Why the authors measured HAMD and HAMA score again even though the psychiatric illness history was formerly ruled out in the exclusion criteria? In addition, brief explanation of these scores is needed. 6. Need more detailed instructions about the drinking-ultrasonography. For example, how did volunteers drink water in supine position? By a cup? By a straw? The authors described that the emptying period was calculated 5 and 10 min after drinking the total 800ml of water. This sentence was very ambiguous. How did they calculate the period, by measuring the time or measuring the cross-sectional area of the lumen? 7. The authors scored the discomfort (such as ‘abdominal fullness’, not separating the symptoms) of volunteers to drink water in supine position by VAS analogue. It would be reasonable to check subdivided symptoms (abdominal pain, abdominal fullness, regurgitation etc.) and add up each score (Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2011; 34: 638-648). 8. It is not common to use one way ANOVA to compare two groups. The results could be the same. However, using student t-test in comparing the continuous variables between two groups is necessary. 9. In Discussion section, the authors cited reference 19 to

compare the author's results with this article. However, citalopram is a SSRI that has different mechanism with TCA. I think it is not appropriate to compare these two drugs. Thus, the authors should modify the present manuscript, somehow 10. The authors must comment the limitation of this study before the conclusion. For instance, total number is quite small because the subjects were healthy volunteers. etc. Minor: 1. More detailed descriptions about the exclusion criteria are needed. 2. The last paragraph of method section, the explanation of table 1, was a mention about the result. It would be better to comment them in the result section. 3. OCTT also reflect small bowel transit time. It should be clarified. 4. The abbreviation in the figure 1 such as AMT should be fully described. And it would be better to indicate 'two weeks wash out period' in figure 1. In table 1-4, it is correct to change '10 mm VAS' to '100 mm (10 cm) VAS'. 5. There must be the standardization of the terms. The authors are using 'serum level' mixed with 'plasma level' or 'blood level', 'analogue' with 'analog'. 6. Please correct many typing errors, spacing errors and expression errors. For example; Page 3, line 5, there will be ";" instead of "," Page 4, line 11, neuropeptide Y Page 4, line 14, AMT instead of ATM Page 9, line 14, moreover instead of morever Page 11, line 3 and 8, elevated instead of evaluated Page 11, line 15, marks of parenthesis is missing