

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31991

Title: Effect of Lactobacillus rhamnosus HN001 and Bifidobacterium longum BB536 on the healthy gut microbiota composition at phyla and species level: a preliminary study

Reviewer's code: 00183459

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-12-23 12:06

Date reviewed: 2016-12-23 16:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a study aimed at assessing the ability of Lactobacillus rhamnosus HN001 and Bifidobacterium longum BB536 to colonize the gut of healthy subjects and to modify the gut microbiota composition. The study is well conducted and the topic is extremely important, as well as the results.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31991

Title: Effect of Lactobacillus rhamnosus HN001 and Bifidobacterium longum BB536 on the healthy gut microbiota composition at phyla and species level: a preliminary study

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-12-23 12:06

Date reviewed: 2017-01-02 19:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is generally an interesting and well written paper. The authors studied the effects of two probiotics on the healthy gut microbiota composition, including levels of both phyla and species. The research showed a significant reduction of potential harmful bacteria and increase of beneficial ones. I appreciate the quality of the experimental design, results and figures. The authors are experienced in the field of microorganisms and probiotics, and this is obviously remarked. However, I would have some comments: A. ABSTRACT: I would suggest more details in the abstract, regarding Methods (number of participants, explanation about pre-prandial and post-prandial groups, doses of the two probiotics). B. INTRODUCTION 1. Definition of probiotics – not correct. The recent consensus statement reference should be used: “Hill C, Guarner F, Reid G, et al. The International Scientific Association for Probiotics and Prebiotics consensus statement on the scope and appropriate use of the term probiotic. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2014;11:506-514”. According to it, probiotics are “NON-PATHOGENIC live micro-organisms that, when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host” The used reference is from 2001 and it was NOT included in the

reference list. 2. Instead of mentioning a very old reference (Kaur - nr. 3 - from 2002): many recent papers are available, written by experts in the field, regarding the use of probiotics in preventing and/or treating some diseases – like “Floch MH. Recommendations for probiotic use in humans – a 2014 update. *Pharmaceuticals*. 2014;7:999-1007”. Or “Floch MH, Walker WA, Sanders ME, Nieuwdorp M, Kim AS, Brenner DA, Qamar AA, Miloh TA, Guarino A, Guslandi M, Dieleman LA, Ringel Y, Quigley EM, Brandt LJ. Recommendations for Probiotic Use - 2015 Update: Proceedings and Consensus Opinion. *J Clin Gastroenterol*. 2015 Nov-Dec;49 Suppl 1:S69-73.” 3. Reference nr. 6 is old. Many recent reviews are available about safety. Like “Doron S, Snyderman DR. Risk and safety of probiotics. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015 May 15;60 Suppl 2:S129-34”. 4. I think the sentence “Nowadays, hundreds of different bacterial strains are available in the global probiotic market and consequently, the choice of the most suitable probiotic product becomes very complex and dispersive.” should be rephrased. A choice cannot be very complex, but maybe difficult. 5. The sentence “Alone or in combination, these microorganisms exhibit several healthy beneficial properties, such as antagonistic activities against microbial pathogens and enhancement of the anti-inflammatory response [8,9].” should be inserted after the one mentioning the beneficial effects of probiotics. 6. The sentence “Moreover, they are often associated with alleviation of lactose intolerance [10], improvement of bacterial, antibiotic or radiotherapy induced diarrhea [11-13], anti-carcinogenic effects [14] and even blood cholesterol reduction [15].” should be inserted after mentioning about probiotic use in preventing/treating some diseases. 7. The sentence “Even if in literature there is few and contentious information about the ability of probiotics to modulate the host’s gut microbiota composition and maintaining the intestinal homeostasis, these latter have been proposed as one of the main mechanisms by which probiotics exert their beneficial effects [16].” is too long and confusing. 8. In short, “INTRODUCTION” paragraph is too long, some data are redundant, some sentences are too long and confusing. I suggest shortening and reviewing the full paragraph. Also, not all the studies described in detail the “INTRODUCTION” are really needed there. On the contrary, the authors could (maybe) mention more published studies that used *L rhamnosus* HN001 and *B longum* BB536.

C. MATERIALS AND METHODS: “During the month of probiotic consumption, some problems of product resuspension have been highlighted.” – please explain.

D. DISCUSSION 1. The auth