Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair

	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　　[Y] Grade B: Good　　[ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing　[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority)　[Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision　[ ] Major revision　[ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　[ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous　[Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well-design study adding new information to the literature. Authors in a clear and simply way managed to give their results as well as the relative literature. I have no comments to make and in my opinion the article can be published unaltered.

Response: I extend my gratitude to the reviewer for their meticulous evaluation of the manuscript and their adept commentary, as well as their encouraging feedback. A comprehensive review by a native English speaker has been undertaken, resulting in numerous subtle enhancements to the grammar and style across the text. With these revisions, we aspire to have aligned the manuscript more closely with your expectations.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86164

Title: Unveiling the Hidden World of Gut Health: Exploring Cutting-edge Research through Visualizing Randomized Controlled Trials on the Gut Microbiota

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05504262

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: DA, DNB, MBBS, MNAMS

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: Palestine

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-26 18:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-26 18:23

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair

	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a well-written and informative review of the latest research on the gut microbiota. The authors do an excellent job of summarizing the current state of knowledge, and they provide a clear and concise overview of the key findings of recent randomized controlled trials. The paper is well-organized and easy to follow, and the figures are clear and helpful.

Response: I extend my gratitude to the reviewer for their meticulous evaluation of the manuscript and their adept commentary, as well as their encouraging feedback. A comprehensive review by a native English speaker has been undertaken, resulting in numerous subtle enhancements to the grammar and style across the text. With these revisions, we aspire to have aligned the manuscript more closely with your expectations.

Editorial Office's comments

1) **Science Editor:** The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it' s ready for the first decision.
   Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
   Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: I extend my gratitude to the editor for their meticulous evaluation of the manuscript and their adept commentary, as well as their encouraging feedback. A comprehensive review by a native English speaker has been undertaken, resulting in numerous subtle enhancements to the grammar and style across the text. With these revisions, we aspire to have aligned the manuscript more closely with your expectations.

2) **Company Editor-in-Chief:** I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

   Response: Dear editor, thank you very much for the comments and suggestions. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to improve and resubmit our manuscript. The comments and suggestions are valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. According to the referees' comments and suggestions, we have made revisions, as described in the authors' response.

3) Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

   Response: very thanks for this suggestion. We used it (see methods, and Table 5).