

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17670

**Title:** Effects of Ligustrum Robustum on Gut Microbes and Obesity in Rats

**Reviewer's code:** 02861045

**Reviewer's country:** Ireland

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-18 21:08

**Date reviewed:** 2015-05-27 22:34

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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

1. There are a lot of errors in the English in the manuscript. This sometimes makes it difficult to understand.
2. There are a few errors in the conventions of taxonomic classifications. Ensure genus names have a capital letter at the start and species names have a lower case letter e.g. *Ligustrum robustum*
3. Be consistent with either US English or UK English in your spelling
4. I found the results (text) regarding the T-RFLP analysis difficult to understand
5. The figure legends are lacking in detail. There is no information about group size/number of experiments performed etc.
6. Many tables lack units for the values shown
7. Is it usual that results vary depending on the detection methods used, as you found with the *Bifidobacterium*? You discuss that different groups obtain different results but not if other groups have had similar discrepancies when they use more than one method of detection.
8. I think many of your results would be better presented as graphs rather than tables.