

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19884

Title: Study between irritable bowel syndrome-diarrhea and ulcerative colitis based on the 5-hydroxytryptophan signaling pathway

Reviewer's code: 02458507

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2015-05-25 09:09

Date reviewed: 2015-06-22 17:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

Interesting study, it can be accepted for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19884

Title: Study between irritable bowel syndrome-diarrhea and ulcerative colitis based on the 5-hydroxytryptophan signaling pathway

Reviewer's code: 02098394

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2015-05-25 09:09

Date reviewed: 2015-06-22 17:27

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 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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors studied the visceral sensitivity differences of colonic mucosa and remission of UC, basing on 5-HT signaling pathway, in order to explore the relevance of the pathogenesis of visceral hypersensitivity and clinical manifestations between the two diseases. The authors found that the IBS-D group and UC group with same syndromes have similar changes in the clinical symptom scores and visceral sensitivity, indicators of the serotonin signaling pathway in plasma and colonic mucosa, but the pain threshold and 5-HT₇R expression in colonic mucosa were significantly changed. All of that reveal that the two diseases have relevance in visceral sensitivity pathogenesis and clinical manifestations, and clarify that visceral hypersensitivity possibly due to the differences of the 5-HT₇ receptor levels in 5-HT signaling pathway. The study is well designed, and the results are interesting. But some revisions should be made before acceptance. 1 Although the study is interesting, the manuscript is not well written. A great deal of language polishing should be revised. And the manuscript need a big editing. 2 The results are interesting, but not well discussed. Please revise the discuss section. Some more ref. needed. 3 Too many tables. Please check if some tables can be deleted.