

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 44649

Title: Gut Microbiota Profile in Healthy Indonesian

Reviewer's code: 00036810

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-11-22

Date reviewed: 2018-11-29

Review time: 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have demonstrated that the composition of gut microbiota in Indonesian subjects. The data from this study seems to be important and informative. However, this article has several issues. I hope that the authors revise this manuscript as following comments.

- 1) Did you check the diversity of microbiota in each groups?

Answer:

Yes, it is explained in Table 1. Microbiota Profile Comparison

- 2) The authors should clearly definite age category between younger and older subjects in the section of materials and methods.

Answer:

The elderly subjects are within 70 years old and above, while the young subjects are within 25-45 years old. This information had been added in the materials and methods section

- 3) The information regarding another agent proton pump inhibitors, anti-cancer drugs, and anti-diabetic agents and so on, which may affect the structure of gut microbiota.

Answer:

Information regarding the references of agent proton pump inhibitors, anti-cancer drugs, and anti-diabetic agents are added in the 8th paragraph on the discussion section. There are a total of five references added which are references number 19-24.

- 4) The data regarding stool consistency and frequency are missing

Answers:

Missing data already inserted in **Table 1** and **Table 2**.

- 5) After all, what is differences between Bali and Yogyakarta subjects? This issue should be clearly described.

Answers:

In the introduction section it had been explained,

“Previous results ^[6] revealed that gut microbiota of Indonesian in school aged children represented by two unique populations were quite distinct from those in other countries. Yogyakarta and Bali regions were selected to represent Javanese tribe, the most abundant and widely spreading throughout Indonesia archipelago and Balinese tribe which mainly only concentrated in Bali Island, but those tribes have different life style and diets as those strongly associated with different religions and beliefs. Based on these facts, Yogyakarta and Bali are selected as the sites of current studies as those also performed in previous study^[6]”

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[] The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

BPG Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 44649

Title: Gut Microbiota Profile in Healthy Indonesian

Reviewer's code: 03699937

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-12-03

Date reviewed: 2018-12-03

Review time: 0 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced <input type="checkbox"/> General <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I was reading this paper and found it interesting for publication in WJG.

- 1) Add some new references in this field using scopus to enrich your text and ideas

Answers:

References added using scopus regarding the references of agent proton pump inhibitors, anti-cancer drugs, and anti-diabetic agents are added in the 8th paragraph on the discussion section. There are a total of five references added which are references number 19-24.

- 2) Write a better discussion according to your results

Answers:

Well noted. The discussion is added with references regarding agent proton pump inhibitors, anti-cancer drugs, and anti-diabetic agents. Moreover, the explanation about missing data (stool consistency and stool frequency) had been added.

3) Describe why you have chose these sorts of bacteria and why not others!

Answers:

The chosen bacteria composition is referring to previous paper that also conducting a joint research with Yakult Honsha Ltd. Here is the bibliography of the mentioned reference,

[6] Greenhill AR, Tsuji H, Ogata K, Natsuhara K, Morita A, Soli K, Larkins JA, Tadokoro K, Odani S, Baba J, Naito Y, Tomitsuka E, Nomoto K, Siba PM, Horwood PF, Umezaki M. Characterization of the gut microbiota of Papua New Guineans using reverse transcription quantitative PCR. *PLoS One* 2015;**10**:1–15 [PMID: 25658868 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0117427]

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 44649

Title: Gut Microbiota Profile in Healthy Indonesian

Reviewer's code: 03796332

Reviewer's country: Reviewer_Country

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-11-22

Date reviewed: 2018-12-07

Review time: 15 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The original finding of the manuscript is revealed the distribution of culturable bacteria, yeast, and mold in Indonesian. However, there are big problems in the experimental design and results analysis.

- 1) The author did not indicate the background of people selected in the study, since they came from different places and have different diet habits. The differences were not only caused by ages, but also places and diet habits, although some diet limitation was made before the study. However, that was not enough to eliminate the differences caused by their backgrounds

Answers:

The authors choose a different places and group age because the authors also want

to compare the results of gut microbiota composition for subjects from different places and group age. Therefore we do not eliminate the differences caused by the backgrounds.

- 2) The results from RT-PCR and culture method could not be compared since CFU could not be obtained from the RT-PCR method, and, RT-PCR measured the overall bacteria distribution, whereas, culture method only indicated very small part of bacteria. The results from two methods were not comparable.

Answers:

The authors choose to conduct the analysis using RT-PCR and culture method because of this reason,

“Culture dependent method is the conventional cultivation method that rarely used by now due to several limitation such as time consuming and high bias regarding to unculturable bacteria. Hence, culture independent method based on sequencing of cloned 16S rRNA was introduced and it is a rapid method that has high accuracy (Eckburg, 2005). However, most of culture independent method can not distinguish between live or dead cell since its calculation base on DNA concentration and may loss of less abundant bacteria due to insufficient sequencing. Meanwhile, culture dependent method by using selective media provide the detection of inferior bacteria. Thus, in this research we did comparison between culture method and YIF SCAN based on 16S rRNA method to analysed gut microbiota composition of subjects.”

This reason is also mentioned in the Introduction section.

- 3) Study was only carried out on the culturable bacteria, yeast, and mold that were only a very small part of gut microbiota. Therefore, they could not reflect the microbiota profile in the samples. So, the main text and title were not consistent.

Answers:

Well noted for the suggestion. However, the authors choose to not change the title as some references (reference number 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11) also used “gut microbiota” in their title even though same composition of gut microbiota is analyzed. Therefore the authors consider not to change the title as well.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No