

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41644

**Title:** Counteraction of perforated cecum lesions in rats: effects of pentadecapeptide BPC 157, L-NAME and L-arginine

**Reviewer's code:** 03262127

**Reviewer's country:** Russia

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-24

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-30

**Review time:** 6 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review of the Manuscript 41644 1) This is a well designed, performed and written research paper on an actual topic. I have found few errors and want to present few remarks only. 2) For a general reader, it can be important to clarify, how the cecums

were assessed at a long-term period? Did you perform relaparotomy? (I think, yes). Please note this in the text. 3) How many animals died from peritonitis during the experiment in different groups? 4) Figure 3: in a Legend, you have explained all abbreviations under columns except “B” (apparently, it was BPC 157). 5) Why did you use letters B and C for your figures (e.g., not traditional A and B)? 6) There are some inaccuracies in References 5 and 37. To be corrected. 7) I think, your amount of self-citations is excessive (even taking into account the fact that your team wrote most of the work on BPC 157).

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41644

**Title:** Counteraction of perforated cecum lesions in rats: effects of pentadecapeptide BPC 157, L-NAME and L-arginine

**Reviewer's code:** 01213231

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-20

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-31

**Review time:** 11 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I READ THIS INTERESTING PAPER: THE STUDY WAS WELL CONDUCTED, SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY WAS RIGOROUS, THE PROBLEM OF THE PAPER IS THAT ENGLISH IS NOT FLUENT AND SOMETIMES NOT VERY CLEAR, SO THE



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

TEXT RESULTS DIFFICULT TO READ. THERE ARE MANY STUDIES ON BPC-157 THAT SHOWED TO BENEFIT IN INTESTINAL ANASTOMOSIS AND WOUNDS IN RATS AND READING THESE PAPERS I HOPE IT WILL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT EVEN IN HUMANS FOR CLINICAL APPLICATION.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No