

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear authors, thank you for submitting your paper to the World Journal of Gastroenterology. Your study is a well-written, good structured recommendation to explore the gut bacterial composition in wild adult rats from Hainan province in China. The information is good for identify microbial communities and is useful for disease control. Thank you for a useful and important synopsis of this important topic. The reviewer thinks this manuscript can further benefit from grammatical revisions.

Thanks to the reviewer's suggestion. Thank you very much for your recognition of our research. We have sent our manuscript to a professional English language editing company to polish the manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript "Comparative analysis of the gut microbiota of wild adult rats from nine district areas in Hainan, China" by Lina Niu et al. compared the gut bacterial communities in faecal samples from 162 wild rats of three species and nine geographic locations in Hainan by 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. It is well written and highly interesting. The experiment of the study is designed very well. The methods of data analysis are very clear, and the results are presented well. However, the following points must be considered before publication. In my opinion, The ABSTRACT can be structured, such as divided into background, aim, method, result and conclusion, which can be presented more clearly. In this study, there are 5 figures, 2 tables, and 5 supplementary tables that provide rich data for microbial community information. In addition, authors also make a lot of analysis on the data obtained, but there are still some data that need to be reconfirmed, for example, 'Figure 2' on page 8, line 14, which should be Figure 3.

According to the reviewer's advice, we have revised the abstract and formed a structured abstract. Meanwhile, we have reconfirmed all the research data in the article.