



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_24586
Title of the Manuscript:	Improvement of health by probiotics: The roles on human gut, metabolic disorder and immune modulation
Type of the Article	Review article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Style of the listed references in the section of Reference had better be unified and consistent. Reference [8] is overlapped should be deleted. 2. Line 10-11, "To inhibit... bacteria." Should be deleted. 3. Line 337, the meaning of sentence is unclear. 4. Line 146-149, the meaning of sentence is unclear. 5. Line 370-384, the meaning of sentence is unclear. 6. Line 393-397, the meaning of sentence is unclear. 7. Line 422-425, the meaning of sentence is unclear.	Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 17. Inflammation→inflammation; <i>Helicobacterpylori</i>→ <i>Helicobacter pylori</i>; Lactose→ lactose. 2. Line 18, atopyand ... →atopy and... 3. Line 151, gutmicrobiome→ gut microbiome 4. Line 172,in vivotrials → in vivo trials 5. Line 191, caused → caused a 6. Line 240, two-foldpro biotics-induced → two-fold probiotics-induced 7. Line 259, in-vivostudies → in vivo studies 8. Line 372, childers → children	Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved Improved
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The overall description is fluent, readable, and informative. It can be recommended for publish in the Journal. However, there are some unclear and unsmooth sentences and typo need to be revised before it can be accepted for publication.	