

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 19564

Title: In vivo analysis of intestinal permeability following hemorrhagic shock

Reviewer's code: 03346882

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-05-20 13:54

Date reviewed: 2015-06-06 04:19

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

This is a well written study investigating intestinal permeability after shock in a rodent model. I have provided my comments and concerns in the attachment, which mostly focus on some clarifications regarding the animal model and methods used for data analysis.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 19564

Title: In vivo analysis of intestinal permeability following hemorrhagic shock

Reviewer's code: 02954046

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-05-20 13:54

Date reviewed: 2015-05-23 21:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 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

The authors describe an interesting work about in vivo translocation of bowel-generated proteolytically-cleaved peptides from the small bowel lumen to the circulation, in rats with bowel hypoperfusion due to peripheral exsanguination. The manuscript has good iconography and the limitations are well expressed. It is also well written and easy to read. I wonder why the differences between the two groups regarding systemic concentrations of proteolytically-generated peptides from fluorescently labelled casein (fig. 1) were only statistically different in the first 40 minutes. What do you think it happened between the minute 40 and the reperfusion time? Do you think that is some kind of mucosa adaptation or something related to the experimental protocol? As you say, low flow due to hypotension can underestimate these values; even so, it is interesting to see that the fluorescence drops from minute 40 to 100 - maybe because a more severe lower blood flow state as the organism is subject to a more time of hypotension? So, can we think that the more detrimental translocation occurs in the first minutes after a major bleeding, and after 20 minutes it loses relevance? If this is the case, we can think that translocation is not important for the perpetuation of the shock, since it is only significant in the first minutes. What is your opinion? Also, in the



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

manuscript you always talk about hemorrhagic shock in general. Do you think that the results will be reproducible if the cause of the hemorrhagic shock was an upper GI bleeding, with the consequent large amount of blood in the small bowel? Do you think that the results would be even more different between the two groups due to the large amount of protein in the lumen? For reproductivity purposes maybe in the conclusions of the study you should highlight that the hemorrhagic shock was due to non-GI bleeding.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 19564

Title: In vivo analysis of intestinal permeability following hemorrhagic shock

Reviewer's code: 02908309

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-05-20 13:54

Date reviewed: 2015-05-26 03:08

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 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 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

This study demonstrate that small bowel ischemia results in marked and early increases in gut membrane permeability in response to experimental hemorrhagic shock and discusses the translocation of bowel cleaved peptides from de small bowel lumen to the circulation. The study is very interesting and it is apparent the tremendous effort done in it. The aim and results are clear and the data qualify publishing. I have few simple comments: 1- The abstract needs to structured in sections (Aim, Methods, results, conclusion) 2- In line231 the author mentioned "These studies demonstrate that early increases in small bowel permeability occur during experimental hemorrhagic shock....." What is meant by these studies!! I think it is a typo as it should be written: This study 3- At the end of discussion it would be better if the authors write a section titled Conclusions or a paragraph that starts with "in conclusion" summarizing the most important finding of the study