

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24364

**Title:** Faecalibacterium prausnitzii supernatant ameliorates DSS-induced colitis by regulating Th17 cells differentiation

**Reviewer's code:** 00009292

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-25 10:08

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-01 20:31

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study investigates the preventive and therapeutic role of Faecalibacterium prausnitzii supernatant in a mouse model of UC induced by dextran sulphate. The paper is interesting, I have however some comments in particular on data presentation. Materials and methods should be better explained, in particular How was colon histopathologic grading calculated? how many samples per animal were considered? How was colon length measured? the protocol for isolation of mononuclear cells from mouse spleen should be added, or at least a reference. Quantification for immunohistochemistry should be briefly explained. In the Results, the statistical analyses are not always clear, I think Authors should add in the figures some horizontal lines, showing between which samples the comparison was made. Finally, Discussion is too long and should be reduced.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24364

**Title:** Faecalibacterium prausnitzii supernatant ameliorates DSS-induced colitis by regulating Th17 cells differentiation

**Reviewer's code:** 01434943

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-25 10:08

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-03 12:06

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 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"/> 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

English grammar needs major attention. Specific comments: TITLE: 'DSS' should be written in full 'cell' and not 'cells' ABSTRACT: Need to mention that UC (in full) was induced by DSS. INTRODUCTION: Needs to be written more scientifically and concisely. Need to avoid subjective comparisons such as 'supernatant was better than...'. A hypothesis or specific aim is required. METHODS: Well explained but past tense is required. RESULTS: English grammar attention is required in virtually every sentence. However, the data are clear and well presented. DISCUSSION: A good summary. There should be some discussion of the potential influence of the F prau growth medium and also some reference to other probiotic supernatant studies (eg Studies by Wang-H and also Prisciandaro-L).

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24364

**Title:** Faecalibacterium prausnitzii supernatant ameliorates DSS-induced colitis by regulating Th17 cells differentiation

**Reviewer's code:** 00036825

**Reviewer's country:** Hungary

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-25 10:08

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-16 04:53

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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper merit the publication. The topic has high clinical interest. The design and methods have clear scientific values. Comments: Male mice were applied. Responses on the treatment should be different in males and females? Results: Figure 2.A: difficult to differentiate the curves. IL-4 plasma level: written in the text "IL-17A, IL-6 and IL-4 were significantly higher in the model group." While on the Figure 3., the plasma level of IL-4 is in decrease when compared to the controls. Mucosal tissue was taken from the colon for measuring the expression of cytokines. How the mucosa was separated, what was the amount and protein content?