

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16399

**Title:** Potential protective effects of *Clostridium butyricum* on experimental gastric ulcers in mice.

**Reviewer's code:** 00504545

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-16 12:14

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-04 15:39

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In my opinion this experimental paper is very well designed, is clearly written and the discussion is rich. The tables and figures illustrate very well the obtained results and the conclusions are clear. Only in fig. 7 I detected a small mistake. You must change *H. pylori* by *H. pylori*. That's all!

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16399

**Title:** Potential protective effects of *Clostridium butyricum* on experimental gastric ulcers in mice.

**Reviewer's code:** 00053723

**Reviewer's country:** Brazil

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-16 12:14

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-08 15:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input 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

This manuscript is of low scientific importance, because authors have used a pretreatment with mixture containing *C. butyricum* to "treat" ulcer induced by different methods. The conclusions are not supported by the presented data. All the results can be a consequence of a preventive and not a curative effect. Thus, it has little to do with real situations of ulcer. Second, the ethical concerns are serious, because instead of using several models of ulcer induction it would be much more apropos to use one model and explore whether administration of *C. butyricum* after ulcer induction (and not before) would protect or not the ulcer installation. The conclusions and schemes about the effects of *C. butyricum* are mere speculation, because the presence of *C. butyricum* might have a antiulcer effect by the simple fact that a "non-specific" bacterium was administered previous to the ulcer induction. Third the formulation or pharmaceutical preparation used is questionable. Is it possible to "administrate" bacteria in culture medium? I mean is it possible to have stable and alive *C. butyricum* at the concentration administered for an instantaneous ingestion by patients?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16399

**Title:** Potential protective effects of *Clostridium butyricum* on experimental gastric ulcers in mice.

**Reviewer's code:** 03258318

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-16 12:14

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-31 22:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The number of mices is so high regarding ethical issue. Please add this as limitation.