



J. K. Press

Journal Name:

[Journal of Biology and Nature](#)

Manuscript Number:

Ms_JOBAN_11962

Title of the Manuscript:

Expression of sialic acid α 2-3 and α 2-6 in MCF cells stimulated with lipopolysaccharide

Type of the Article



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Not really. It depends on whether the ms delivers a correct message to the community.</p> <p>2. OK, but could be better. "Expression of α2,3 and α2,6 sialic acid on MCF cells upon stimulation with lipopolysaccharide"</p> <p>3. See comments in ms. Conclusion is not correct in abstract.</p> <p>4. Not really. Need to move results out of legend. Some discussion part should be in the introduction.</p> <p>5. No. Lots of errors in grammar and English language. This suggests that the authors are careless of writing. This puts doubts in reviewers' head whether the authors are making the correct conclusions, which are clearly not.</p> <p>First, the RT-PCR results suggest that there is no significant upregulation of the mRNAs of both enzymes. The only increase at 4 hrs for ST3GAL1 could be experimental error, as there is huge standard deviation. I highly doubt this is after 3 repeated experiments.</p> <p>So, there is no data backing the conclusion that mRNA is increased.</p>	



	Besides, it is too short for mRNA increase and then translate into enzyme proteins and show increase of sialylation on the cell surface. Most likely, it is the re-organization of the enzyme-substrate complex that causes increased sialylation. Some prestored a2,6 sialic acid bearing proteins can be trafficking from intracellular vesicles onto the cell surface. All these possibility can be discussed, but unfortunately the authors did not.	
Minor REVISION comments	Lots of grammar issues.	
1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wenda Gao
Department, University & Country	U.S