

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 90913

Title: Effects of *Lactobacillus paracasei* N1115 on gut microbial imbalance and liver function in patients with hepatitis B-related cirrhosis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05845795

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-18 20:05

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-18 21:11

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The work presented to me for review is interesting and contains a lot of useful clinical information. I have a few critical comments: 1. There is no information on how many patients from the group treated with LP N1115 passed stools initially and after 3 months of intervention (the enigmatic information of 54 patients did not do so), it is insufficient, because conclusions were drawn based on the number of collected stool samples - ? 2. There is no information on how feces were collected in the group of 74 patients who received only general treatment. Was an analogy used and stool samples were collected once initially or twice, i.e. after 3 months of treatment? 3. Were antibiotics or proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) used in both groups, and if so, why were antibiotics and PPIs used? 4. How old were the patients? 5. How many women and how many men?