

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 3042

**Title:** How much should portal inflow be preserved during portal diversion in 'small-for-size' syndrome?

**Reviewer code:** 00159698

**Science editor:** Wang, Jin-Lei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-04-17 12:19

**Date reviewed:** 2013-06-04 21:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ Y] Grade C (Good)	[ Y] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] No records	[ Y] Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript describes very interesting ideas, and I think the experiments were done well, however the grammatical errors and other internal inconsistencies make it very difficult to determine whether the data support the authors conclusions. Specifically: - in the methods, two different experimental/harvest schedules are described: 1 hour tissue harvest and 48 hour sacrifice vs. 48 hour tissue sampling and 72 hour sacrifice. in general the methods section is much too long but quite unclear with possible redundancies. controls are sometimes called contrasts. was the balloon catheter intraluminal? could be explained better. a 20% complication rate seems very high. - the results section should include interpretation of the data presented. why is a P/A ratio clinically relevant? the methods section is 5 pages, while the results section is only 2 pages. at one point in the results, a 2 hour time point is referenced. very confusing. - sometimes new abbreviations are used and have not been spelled out. i would also re-define S1 and S2 a few times, because their definitions are not intuitive. - table 1 does not have a legend and there is a typo in trilobes (there are many typos throughout the manuscript). Unclear what the listed P values represent (i.e. which groups are being compared). the legend should review what the groups are. Contrast group should be control group (true in all figures) - table 2 would indent BAS, PH, and EUT as the table is very hard to read. the legend should clearly state what the groups are. there should not be 2 legends. Still unclear what the p values represent. - Figure 1 i cannot see label on IVC. would also label renal vein and orient where head is - Figure 2 needs a legend. the lighter colored line is very difficult to see - Figure 3 - is there a difference between A and B and between C and D? - Figure 4 needs a legend. would change Serial to serum - Figure 5 - extremely confusing what



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

the asterisks mean.    these need to be defined.    need to explain PCNA index in legend.    - Figure 6 - explain AI and asterisks    - Figure 7 - did you do three way comparisons for those indicated with asterisks?    these statistics needed to be clearer.    The results section really needs to spell out what the data mean.