



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Experimental Medicine

**Manuscript NO:** 34092

**Title:** Surgical and immune reconstitution murine models in bone marrow research: potential for exploring mechanisms in sepsis, trauma and allergy

**Reviewer's code:** 02714633

**Reviewer's country:** Cyprus

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-28

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-31

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

Needs more evidence of these Models.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Experimental Medicine

**Manuscript NO:** 34092

**Title:** Surgical and immune reconstitution murine models in bone marrow research: potential for exploring mechanisms in sepsis, trauma and allergy

**Reviewer's code:** 00504800

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-28

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-14

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

Overall, this is an extremely detailed, well referenced review of the potential role of the marrow in healing of animal surgical models of disease. The authors raise a number of good points, both about what is in the literature and what is left to do. The manuscript is rather long; the introductory portions (up to page 14) could be shortened somewhat. It needs some minor non-scientific English editing. I recommend it for publication after minor editing. Specific recommendations: - "Bone marrow" does not need a hyphen between bone and marrow. - The first section (pges 3-7) could use some subheadings to break up this long section. - Page 15, section f, second line: I would change to "how CAN complex strategies"... - Please make sure abbreviations are defined at first use; for example, on page 19, the abbreviation CLP is used but not defined until the paragraph below. Page 20: Please change "immunodepressed" to "immunoSUppressed", which is more commonly used and understood. - Page 31: I would suggest a concluding paragraph to summarize and tie concepts together at the end.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Experimental Medicine

**Manuscript NO:** 34092

**Title:** Surgical and immune reconstitution murine models in bone marrow research: potential for exploring mechanisms in sepsis, trauma and allergy

**Reviewer's code:** 03010350

**Reviewer's country:** Russia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-28

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-15

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

Dear editor. I read with great interest the article. After reading it, new ideas developed. I think that from this point of view, and with other readers of WJEM, as well as I will have new thoughts. The authors propose and discuss original experimental models, one of which I was very interested in and will refer to it. Therefore, I think that this article can be accepted. I would recommend cutting the section on the experimental model with sepsis. At the end of the article, the authors need to add a conclusion.