Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Respirology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 2538
Title: Effects of methyl palmitate and lutein on LPS-induced acute lung injury in rats.
Reviewer code: 00608223
Science editor: Huang, Xin-Zhen
Date sent for review: 2013-02-27 15:58
Date reviewed: 2013-03-08 20:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript assessed a rat model of ALI, and on the whole is well written, if somewhat long. The authors should be congratulated on their comprehensive assessment of ALI pararmeters i.e. wet/dry weight, BALF protein, cellular infiltration, histological scoring and a cytokine of choice, in this case TNFa. It might benefit from addressing the following points Major comments 1) The author have used LPS exposure as a model of ALI; this is a fairly well accepted model, but is also a model of sepsis, which the authors have not discussed, nor have they mentioned whether systemic outcomes were measured in their animals. It would be useful to acknowledge the systemic aspects of their work, and if not done say why systemic markers(serum IL6/TNFa/MPO) were not measured. 2) The neutrophilic response seen in the lung was quite high - it would have been nice to look at some markers relevant to neutrophil recruitment (e.g. BAL IL8) or a more specific marker of neutrophil inflammatory activity (e.g. tissue MPO activity) in addition to the markers already done. 3) Whilst the manuscript gives a hint of substances that may be protective against ALI, and in the case of lutein (which is in the diet of man) potentially useful clinically, it does not give any indication of the mechanism by which this occurs. For example - are they directly affecting neutrophil recruitment/retention/apoptosis or macrophage activation/retention/recruitment. 4) The timing and systemic or ALI nature of the effect is not very clear to me - are these maintained 6hrs post iv? Is the pre-treatment having a systemic effect, which then means the lung-specific inflammation is altered given that the agents are being administered orally and/IP? Given that it may not be possible to repeat the experiments, I understand that many of the recommendations made above might rely on spare samples being available in freezers. If it is not possible to do the work, then these points should be addressed in the discussion, or elsewhere in the manuscript. Minor comments 1)

The manuscript is quite long - it measures at over 3700 words, excluding figure legends, tables and abstract. I would like to see it reduced to somewhere between 3000-3500 at most. The section that I think is over long at present is the discussion - there is some repetition of things mentioned in the introduction, and in general it is very verbose. I think that the additions I have suggested ought to be achievable within the above words, although a methods supplement could be considered if required to reduce word counts. 2) The introduction ends without a statement of aims so it is hard to see why the experiments were run. 3) The discussion should open with a single sentence on the main findings (i.e. reduction in ALI with treatment) and contain within it some hint of potential clinical relevance - where do the authors see this going in the future? 4) Throughout the discussion the results are restated a lot, which adds to the length issues - this can be omitted and the reader referred back to the relevant section in the results 5) The discussion would benefit from being divided into subsections - perhaps one on methyl palmidate and one on lutein, with another section on validity of the model and a final one on proposed mechanism, prior to the conclusion. I think this would help avoid repetition and focus the meaning of the work. Assuming the authors are able to do some of the systemic work suggested then each of the intervention sections of the discussion should be further split to lung and systemic effects.

Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Respirology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 2538
Title: Effects of methyl palmitate and lutein on LPS-induced acute lung injury in rats.
Reviewer code: 00608247
Science editor: Huang, Xin-Zhen
Date sent for review: 2013-02-27 15:58
Date reviewed: 2013-03-08 22:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The author studied effects of methyl palmitate and lutein on ALI in rats. The results are interesting and comprehensive. The experiemnt is well designed and reasoned. Minor language polishing is required.

Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Respirology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 2538
Title: Effects of methyl palmitate and lutein on LPS-induced acute lung injury in rats.
Reviewer code: 00214274
Science editor: Huang, Xin-Zhen
Date sent for review: 2013-02-27 15:58
Date reviewed: 2013-03-11 06:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with interest this work on protective effects of methyl-palmitate and lutein on LPS induced ALI in rats. The primary goal was to demonstrate a significant improvement on cellular damage and biomarkers between rats treated with protective agents compared to untreated rats. The authors intend also to discuss the mechanism involved in lung protection. The data are clearly presented. However I have some remarks that could improve the quality of this manuscript. General remarks: The manuscript is too long and the authors mixed in the discussion paragraph data that must be presented in the introduction or in the method paragraph, and only in these paragraphs, with discussion of their results. Many redundancies must be avoided. Furthermore, the discussion paragraph is not very clearly presented and you should organize your discussion in a more structured way. I am not totally convinced that data presented allow a fair discussion of the mechanism involved in lung protection. As the authors demonstrated clearly the effects of methyl-palmitate and lutein are not strictly equivalent. A few words on clinical interest of this work could be added. Minor remarks: Before using W/D ratio (in the introduction) you must indicate the full words weight/dry.