



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_34492
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF PROBIOTICS ON INTESTINAL MICROFLORA OF HIV-INFECTED INDIVIDUALS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first sentence in the introduction section needs to be corrected in proper English. Surely there also cannot only be 1014 organisms in the human gut? 2. LPS needs to be defined. Write out the word with the abbreviation in brackets. 3. 2.1 Patients: this section must be corrected. The authors specify 40 patients were involved, however from the 2 groups, 44 patients in total are specified i.e. Group 1 = 28 and Group 2 = 16. Also please alter to the following: I: n=28 (70%) patients; II: n=16 patients as the "-" in "I – n" is very confusing. Also rather specify: "of the study was lower than 350 cells / μl" and "higher than 350 cells / μl". Why was the follow up study done on only 20 HIV positive patients? 4. Page 2, line 68: clarify: (probiotics, prebiotics et al.). Also clarify whether antibiotics were used at all as this will also affect the GUT flora (line 67). 	<p>We thank the Reviewer for your interest in our work and for helpful comments that will greatly improve the manuscript and we have tried to do our best to respond to the points raised. As indicated below, we have checked the general and specific comments provided by the Reviewer and have made necessary changes accordingly to their indications.</p> <p>We changed it on lines 12-15; 37.</p> <p>We modified the materials and methods section on page 2.</p> <p>First of all we have 40 patients who agreed to take part in the study, but unfortunately in the second part of the study (where we estimated the influence of probiotics) the number of those who remained was 20, we felt that was enough to continue the study.</p> <p>Patients had received no antibiotic, probiotics, prebiotics and synbiotics therapy in the preceding month. One of the important criteria for exclusion from the study was the lack of antibiotics.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>5. Please rewrite line 69 as some words were left out in the sentence. In addition please insert the reference to the method followed for the inoculation procedure and the regulations specified</p> <p>6. Give a reference to the standard procedures followed.</p> <p>7. Under Results and Discussion: In line 88, the mean value does not correspond to the value in Table 1.</p> <p>8. Line 100: replace the word “broken” with “altered”</p> <p>9. Correct second sentence in line 101 and 102 as the sentence does not make sense.</p> <p>10. Line 111: Rewrite sentence as it is too cryptic.</p> <p>11. Line2 133 and 155: replace word “deep” with “significant”</p> <p>12. Line 145 to 147: Please change words to: The studies showed the dramatic reduction in the levels of lacto-and <i>bifidobacteria</i> and increases in the concentration of pathogenic species, including <i>Candida albicans</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> in HIV-carries [2, 7].</p> <p>13. Line 149: Replace missing words in the sentence.</p> <p>14. Line 169: Correct sentence, add missing words.</p> <p>15. The references in the text does not follow sequentially but start at 6 instead of 1. This must be rectified throughout the text.</p> <p>16. Reference 3: remove the extra semicolons.</p>	<p>We changed it on lines 70-72</p> <p>Thank you for the suggestion, we changed it on line 103.</p> <p>We changed it on lines 120-121.</p> <p>We changed it on lines 128-130</p> <p>183-184 Thank you for the important comments. We have modified the bibliography structure.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>I would suggest that the authors read the manuscript carefully so as to assure themselves that the sentences make sense and that no words are missing within sentences.</p>	