

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"/> 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

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.

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.