

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript number:** 41263

**Manuscript type:** Editorial

**Title:** Unresolved issues in the prophylaxis of bacterial infections in patients with cirrhosis

**Answer to reviewers**

**Reviewer 03262371**

The manuscript entitled "Unresolved issues in the prophylaxis of bacterial infections in patients with cirrhosis" gives the readers some basic and important information regarding the topic and addresses the related remained questions well. In my idea, it does not require any revisions

**Response to reviewer:** Thank you very much for your revision and kind words

**Reviewer 00071640**

Antibiotic prophylaxis of bacterial infections in patients with cirrhosis is important issue in the clinical practice. But, there are not any novelty in this manuscript. It may remember some points for readers

**Response to reviewer:** Thank you very much for your revision. As you mention, there are no novelties in the manuscript since it is an editorial; the point of this type of manuscript is to lay out important and up-to-date information for the reader regarding the chosen. We are happy you think the manuscript has achieved that goal.

**Reviewer 03646639**

Editorial comment entitled ' Unresolved issues in the prophylaxis of bacterial infections in patients with cirrhosis ' is well written manuscript. One would be

interested in effect of long-term antibiotic prophylaxis on gut microbiome in liver cirrhosis. However, I have anything to add. I found any serious problem with the manuscript. I think this article can be accepted.

- 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes.
- 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes.
- 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes.
- 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes.
- 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The author had appropriate data analysis techniques.
- 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes.
- 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes.
- 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes.
- 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes.
- 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes.
- 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes.
- 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes.
- 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate

categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?]  
N/A

**Response to reviewer: Thank you very much for your revision and kind words**

**Reviewer 02860874**

Congratulations, this is in my opinion a very well written paper. I recommend to publish it.

**Response to reviewer: Thank you very much for your revision and kind words**