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 http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 9313
Title: Tricistronic hepatitis C virus subgenomic replicon with Rbm3 IRES expressing double transgenes
Reviewer code: 02447059
Science editor: Su-Xin Gou
Date sent for review: 2014-02-08 17:01
Date reviewed: 2014-02-19 17:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reporting the tricistronic HCV subgenomic replicon with Rbm3 IRES expressing double transgenes in different cell lines and studying the replicative potentials, suppression of replication by different types of antivirals (DAA and the SOF IFN/RBV. They concluded that the tricistronic replicon had best replicative potentials in four of the tested strains, namely sH7. The inhibitory activity was demonstrated for DAA but not for IFN which, as concluded by the authors, might be attributed to suppressed IFN response pathway. The study is very interesting, well designed. The results are well presented and discussed. Yet, some points of concern were raised during revision. Comments to the authors Abstract: 1- The aim does not imply the actual aim, it is rather a background. Please be specific. Introduction 1- Too long and last paragraph include methodology details. Methods 1- A lot of repition of methodology details in result section and figure legends leading to incoherence Results 1- Page 6, the authors reported a mean and SD for RNA copy. What does this mean represents multiple independent experiments or multiple culture wells in the same experiment. 2- Page 12, line 8, alpha for (a) 3- Page 14, DMEM, please indicate cat # and additives in details (glutamine or not, antibiotics type/conc… etc.) Figures 1- Please indicate significance on the figures and not in the legends 2- In the Y axis title of figures 1B, 2A, 2C, 3B, add space before the unit or % 3- Page 27, figure 3D, NS5B was probed in 4 strains only. What is the explanation for deficient probing from other strains? 4- Page 29, Fig 4, what about cell viability in relation to timing? What was

the negative control of the experiment? 5- Page 30, figure 5, was the inability of IFN to inhibit replication in sH7 only? Did you try other cell lines such as Huh-7 for comparison of IFN response? Discussion and conclusion 1- What was the main advantages of the tricistronic over bicistronic replicon, please lead the reader to this information in the conclusion.

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 http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 9313
Title: Tricistronic hepatitis C virus subgenomic replicon with Rbm3 IRES expressing double transgenes
Reviewer code: 01489386
Science editor: Su-Xin Gou
Date sent for review: 2014-02-08 17:01
Date reviewed: 2014-02-24 12:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with interest the manuscript focused on the tricistronic HCV subgenomic replicon with Rbm3 IRES expressing double transgenes. The authors tried to transfect different cell lines and study the replicative potentials and the effect of different antiviral agents. Although this replicon model showed a potential for future drug exploration trials, the authors fail to demonstrate the real advantage of this model compared to bicistronic models. The feasibility of using this replicon system should be accompanied by either efficiency of transfection, stability of the system or improved demonstrative capabilities in comparison to the traditional replicon models that unfortunately it does not seem to be noted in this manuscript. The study however is very well presented. The overall quality of language is good requiring minor revisions.