

Please find the author's reply to the reviewer's comment. We have read thoroughly all the reviewer comments with the constructive criticism which I do respect for the perfection of the manuscript. We have taken all comments into consideration and we answered the questions and revised the text accordingly.

The manuscript titled: Probiotic treatment as therapy for inflammatory bowel disease: its extent and intensity. Manuscript no.:77448.

#### **Author comment**

1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? It is suggested as "Probiotic treatment as supplemental therapeutic strategy for inflammatory bowel disease: its extent and intensity".

**Author response:** Our main focus of the review deals with the therapeutic effect of probiotics in IBD, in place of conventional antibiotic therapy. So, according to our review, probiotic treatment cannot be considered as the supplemental therapeutic strategy.

2. Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? No. It is suggested to choose one of "ROS" and "oxidative stress", which are similar. At the same time, delete "inflammation".

**Author response:** Changes related to Keywords are done, as suggested.

3. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? The introduction is not sufficient to support their review. Actually, it is not suggested to use subtitles in Introduction section.

**Author response:** I have re-written the introduction of the manuscript by focusing on the present study and significance, as suggested.

4. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., and better legends? Yes. Nice draw. Please enlarge the font in the figures

**Author response:** The pictures are prepared in the power point and citations are mentioned in a proper way, as suggested.

5. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? The section of the review was not designed well. The subtitles in this review were unclear. With subtitle in introduction, it is hard to identify the main section in this review. On the other hand, on obvious discussion or

conclusion section in this review. So please re-arrange the whole manuscript to make it clear.

**Author response:** I have re-arranged the whole manuscript to make it clear, as suggested.