



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28260

Title: Anti-Helicobacter pylori effect of CaG-NANA-new sialic acid derivates

Reviewer’s code: 03261349

Reviewer’s country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-29 14:01

Date reviewed: 2016-07-02 14:49

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

In the present paper, entitled “Anti-Helicobacter pylori effect of CaG-NANA; new sialic acid derivates”, Rhee et al have investigated the effect of a compound named Cag-NANA in an animal model of H. pylori gastritis and, in vitro, in bacterial cultures. Main comments: A linguistic revision by a native English speaker is necessary. The meaning of S-NANA and G-NANA is unclear. How was the number of CFU evaluated? In figure 5, it was not explained which treatment was given to the PBS group and, moreover, the meaning of PBS was not fully explained. A group of mice receiving both antibiotics and CaG-NANA would have been useful to investigate whether they have mutual additive effect. The main drawback of the present study is that the evaluation of histological damage is only qualitative. There is no estimation of inflammation, density of H. pylori colonization and gland atrophy by a conventional score.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28260

Title: Anti-Helicobacter pylori effect of CaG-NANA-new sialic acid derivates

Reviewer's code: 00227403

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-29 14:01

Date reviewed: 2016-07-10 02:36

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

H.pylori should be written in this form (and not H. Pylori) At the end of introduction, the sentence: "We designed a new material with NANA, GMP, and calcium (CaG-NANA), and anti-H. pylori activities of CaG-NANA were investigated and in vitro and in vivo." should be "...both in vitro and in vivo". Both in the section "Experimental Design in vivo" and in the section "Inhibitory effect of CaG-NANA on H. pylori in vivo" (RESULTS) there is detailed the division in 4 groups, please delete the latter. When the authors explain (section RESULTS) the changes in the level of serum IL, this should be detailed in the text. In the section introduction the authors should highlight, in one or two sentences, the relevant role of adhesion for H.pylori survival (see, for example "Rosso et al. Update on colonization, survival and antibiotic resistance of H.pylori at the molecular level. Minerva Biotec 2015; 27:149-57" or "Caron et al Tight junction disruption: Helicobacter pylori and dysregulation of the gastric mucosal barrier. World J Gastroenterol. 2015;21:11411-27.").