

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6195

Title: Remote ischaemic postconditioning protects against gastric mucosal lesions in rat

Reviewer code: 02541959

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-10-09 10:02

Date reviewed: 2013-12-08 01:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Study titled "Remote ischaemic postconditioning protects against gastric mucosal lesions in rat" is a very interesting study that falls within the scope World Journal of Gastroenterology. It is able to be published in the journal but I have some minor comments: 1. In the Discussion, 1st paragraph - Additionally, the early study Following surgical operations[20]: I think that the sentence needs revision and must be rephrased 2. In the Discussion, 3st paragraph - A potent surgical therapeutic ... is described that: it may be written - ... is described as ... 3. In the Discussion, 3st paragraph - The present study demonstrate that RIP...: it may be written - It has demonstrated that RIP ... 4. In the Discussion, 6st paragraph - Study suggested that reperfusion ...: it may be written - In a study is suggested that reperfusion ...



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6195

Title: Remote ischaemic postconditioning protects against gastric mucosal lesions in rat

Reviewer code: 02860766

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-10-09 10:02

Date reviewed: 2013-12-20 22:39

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-As regard the cycles of RIB (30 s occlusion and 30 s reperfusion)the author determined the length of cycle (30 s) on what basis? -The author should clarify more how to make use of this study in our clinical practice. -The author should calrify whether isoflurane has any effect on the level of the markers measured in the study or not? -Do we have similar studies to compare with?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6195

Title: Remote ischaemic postconditioning protects against gastric mucosal lesions in rat

Reviewer code: 02861777

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-10-09 10:02

Date reviewed: 2013-12-24 05:15

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comment: the paper demonstrates on a animal rat model that 9+rapid cycles of ischemia/reperfusion seems to protect the gastric mucosa from the effects of prolonged limb ischemia. As authors suggest, immediate remote ischemic postconditioning could have beneficial effects on human severe limb trauma with prolonged ischemia. My first suggestion to authors would be to add some more comment on this point, both in the Discussion section and in the Abstract. On the whole, the paper would benefit a thorough language revision, as some paragraphs are difficult to understand, in particular: Abstract, pag 1, first paragraph: the definition of RIP here is unclear (RIP is defined as a rapid cycle of ischemia/reperfusion in a distant organ and not simply as an "ischemia") and the sentence should be put as an incidental phrase between commas (or rewritten otherwise): "RIP, that refers to..., has been demonstrated..." Pag 4 "the stomach was removed, cut along lesser gastric curvature, rinsed in ice cold saline and divided in three portions". What exactly does it mean this statement? One portion (of the stomach) should have been used for biochemical analysis. But the second and third portions? The following two sections seems redundant (Measurement of gastric mucosal injury" and "Histologic examination"). The tissue samples fixed in formalin, paraffin embedded and HE stained that were scored according to Zhang et al. should be exactly the same that were observed and photographed ("by an experienced pathologist"). If this interpretation were correct, the two sections should be accorped. Moreover, because gastroenterologists are not necessarily aware of the microscopic anatomy of rat stomach, authors should specify where lesions were seen and graded (forestomach, corpus, or pylorus). As regard to histopathology, the actual three slides of figure 4 are useless. They are too small, and as a pathologist,



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

at this magnification, I can not really perceive gastric lesions in figure 4B, and that figure 4C are really better. I would like to see some more histopathologic documentation, with slides at least at 640 pixel, and a visual scale of examples of fields with score 1, 2, 3. A final suggestion to Authors: it would be advisable to stain their stomach slides with Giemsa modified stain or other stains to reveal the presence of *Helicobacter* species: it is important to exclude a possible contribution of subclinical *Helicobacter* infection to the observed gastric lesions.