

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 80090

**Title:** Efficacy of incremental loads of cow's milk as a treatment of lactose malabsorption in Japan

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02462498

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-17 06:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-21 14:54

**Review time:** 4 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article focused on lactose malabsorption (LM) in Japanese, and aimed to examine the efficacy of lactose loading treatment for LM. There are some comments given to the authors as follows: 1. The Background part is too simple to highlight the necessity of this study, and lacks related evidentiary support. Please provide more references about the treatment or progress of this disease. 2. Where were the subjects mainly from? Hospital, social, or university? More importantly, the details of this questionnaire are not attached as the supplementary file, so I am not sure whether the participants who suffered from some intestinal diseases or infections are dropped out. In addition, the total number of the questionnaire held between July 2017 and December 2019 is too small. 3. These results were from participants without the physicians' professional instruction or the physicians' assessment of symptoms. Please state how to promise the accuracy of each participant's feedback, especially when the age of the oldest participant is 68. 4. The degree of abdominal symptoms improvement seems too subjective, rather than quantifying every metric to assess the benefit of lactose-loading treatment. 5. Minor errors should be re-examined, such as the spelling mistake of concent and so on.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 80090

**Title:** Efficacy of incremental loads of cow's milk as a treatment of lactose malabsorption in Japan

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01213276

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Serbia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-29 01:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-29 13:35

**Review time:** 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Lactose loading treatment in lactase-deficient adults is well known method for a half of century (Gilat et al. Lactase in man: a nonadaptable enzyme. Gastroenterology 1972). Because of that fact this article is more suitable for some national journal. If the aim was to evaluate the feasibility of an efficacy of lactose loading treatment in Japan, the study could require a small sample for each site but a relatively large total sample. Because of that, this could only be a pilot study. On my opinion, it is an important note in the text (e.g. "The aim of this study..." change with "The aim of this pilot study...")

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 80090

**Title:** Efficacy of incremental loads of cow's milk as a treatment of lactose malabsorption in Japan

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00058403

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-27 11:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-01 22:48

**Review time:** 5 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic of treatment of lactose intolerance is important and current. The title clearly represents the study developed in this manuscript, the abstract is also concise and complete. However, I suggest some revisions

1. The core type looks like a summary of the article, which is why a text with less data and more information about the relevance of the study could add more to the reader.
2. The writing needs to be revised to make the text more technical and concise, for example: "Doctors (authors) checked the progress ..."
3. Were SIBO patients excluded from the analysis? They could influence the negative response to the treatment with the inclusion of milk, considering that the treatment for SIBO requires the use of antibiotics.
4. Why did the authors choose to assess LM and not IL?
5. Why do you describe the LTBH assessment of improvement in results only? Why 15ppm?
6. The discussion has a long approach to the diagnosis of IL, which, although very important, is not the main objective of the study. So I suggest summarizing this part of the text
7. I suggest avoiding the repetition of data from the study itself in the discussion, for example "In our study, proliferation of the bacterial species was not observed in 29 subjects..."