

**POINT BY POINT IN RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS for the manuscript “Effect of ancient Khorasan wheat on gut microbiota, inflammation and short-chain fatty acids’ production in patients with fibromyalgia” of Baldi S and al.**

**REVIEWER 1**

**Q/S 1:** Providing a workflow will make clearer for understanding the experimental design and analysis. Figure 1 is too simple, consider adding a workflow

**Q/S 1 Reply:** *We thank the reviewer for the improving suggestion. Accordingly, we better described the experimental design and workflow in the Method section (Subheading “Study design and participants”). Moreover, as rightly suggested, we improved the Figure 1.*

**Q/S 2:** In the results of abstract section, more detail data of this study should be given.

**Q/S2 Reply:** *In agreement with the reviewer, we have provided a more detailed results’ section in the abstract (Please, see lines 80-90)*

**Q/S 3:** Format errors were noticed.

**Q/S 3 Reply:** *Thanks for the right suggestion, we have correct all the format errors.*

**Q/S 4:** Please unify the number writing, significant digits and space.

**Q/S 4 Reply:** *We are sorry for the inconvenience. As rightly suggested, we unified number writing, significant digits and spaces.*

**Q/S 5:** Please provide high resolution images for the Figure 2

**Q/S Reply 5:** *In agreement with the reviewer suggestion, we provided a new figure with a higher resolution.*

**Q/S 6:** In the result section, the specific data (e.g. interquartile range, IQR) should be added to illustrate the results.

**Q/S 6 Reply:** *In agreement with the reviewer, in Table 3 (Subheading “Analysis of the fecal molecular inflammatory profile pre- and post- dietary interventions”) we added interquartile ranges also for ILs abundances.*

**Q/S 7:** Please unify the table legends and figure legends.

**Q/S 7 Reply:** *As rightly suggested by the reviewer, we harmonized the legends of all tables and figures.*

**Q/S 8:** The method and results of study population are not enough. For information on the interpretation of the table and figure, the content of discussion was insufficient. We hope the author can further analyze and think about the conclusion.

**Q/S 8 Reply:** *We thank the reviewer for these constructive observations. In order to clarify the Study design and participants' information, first we provided in Method section more study details about participants including inclusion and exclusion criteria (lines 149-188, subheading "Study Design and participants"). Then, in the same section and in Figure 1, we have finely described the study design, coherently with reviewer suggestions (please see the Q/S1). Moreover, we provided a dedicated subheading in Results section regarding the enrolled participants' characteristics (lines 285-295, "Characteristics of the Study Population"). Finally, we revised the discussion, better defining the aims of our study and the conclusions that arises from our experimental design analysis.*

**Q/S 9.** Minor errors in the references were noticed.

**Q/S 9:** *We thank the reviewer for the suggestion and we corrected the errors.*

#### **REVIEWER 2**

*We thank the reviewer for the careful and focused analysis of our study and for the positive words about our work*