

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15108

**Title:** A novel isolated cecal pouch model for endoscopic observation in rats

**Reviewer's code:** 02444931

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-08 22:04

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-19 10:22

| CLASSIFICATION                                    | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                 | PubMed Search:                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <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"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |   | BPG Search:                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision     |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major points: 1.The section of results seem to be too simple. In general, most figures appear in the Results and I strongly advise that surgical procedures had better combine with the section of results. 2.Subfigures of Fig 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 should be merged to produce a complete picture in .JPEG or TIFF format, respectively. 3.Fig 5 and Tab1 should be merged to one figure. 4.Authors claim that the model may be used for evaluation of the efficacy of drug and cell administration. Authors had better add some functional experiments in the model 5.Grammar mistakes should be corrected.