

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11105

**Title:** Hepatoprotective effect of handling of the nitric oxide pathway in a rodent model of acute hepatic failure induced by D-galactosamine

**Reviewer code:** 02461842

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-05 22:52

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-12 21:56

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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		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

I do not have any concerns

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11105

**Title:** Hepatoprotective effect of handling of the nitric oxide pathway in a rodent model of acute hepatic failure induced by D-galactosamine

**Reviewer code:** 00159305

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-05 22:52

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-31 01:54

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"/> Existing	<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	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

To the authors, I have some concerns about your manuscript and I hope you will take into account my suggestions listed below : 1. It must be a common practice for authors to number pages sequentially . 2. There are some grammar errors that must be corrected. 3. 3. Too many abbreviations difficult to follow by the readers of the journal. I. Abstract: Material and methods. Second and third line: please, mention what means L-NAME and L-ARG. Results. Second sentence is confusing (...regardless the dose.... Of what?). II. Core Tip-There is no core tip? III. Introduction Is too long, especially second part. Please, try to make it shorter. First page, first paragraph, line 9: please, delete (MODS) because is not anymore mentioned in the text. First page, last line: L-Arg should be written L-ARG. Second page, first line: "Thus far" should be written "so far". Please, mention similar studies (if any) from the literature in one, two phrases before the aim of your study. IV. Material and methods. Experimental protocols: too many repetitions of Ga 1 N injection, Sigma Aldrich Polska etc.. V. Results. Results section is difficult to read. Again, there are too many abbreviation. Tab. and Fig. should be written Table and Figure throughout the text. Table 1 contains all the information present in Figure 3 and Figure 4. Thus, both figures are unnecessary. Table 2 contains the information given in figure 5 and figure 6. Thus both figures are unnecessary. VI. Discussion. Too long ( about five pages) for literature review and too short for the authors' work. The authors should provide more interpretations on their findings and to underline limitations and



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

strength s of their study. Page 5, second paragraph, first line: “this bags the questions” should be written “this raise the questions” VII. Conclusions. First paragraph, last sentence: please, rewrite and make it clear.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11105

**Title:** Hepatoprotective effect of handling of the nitric oxide pathway in a rodent model of acute hepatic failure induced by D-galactosamine

**Reviewer code:** 00225294

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-05 22:52

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-10 03:53

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper by Saracyn et al. describes a protective role for NO inhibition after GalN challenge. The effect is mainly analyzed at the hepatic level. The work has a reduced impact since the values are at the limit of the statistical significance. Additional work is required to ensure the protective effects (for example, after dual challenge with LPS/DGalN) via this metabolite. Some comments are included. 1. If the hypothesis is correct, it is necessary to evaluate the responses in iNOS-deficient (or other alternative NOS) mice (instead of rats!) 2. A mechanism explaining the protective effects is necessary 3. Is apoptosis or necrosis prevented by the NOS inhibition? How selective is the response?