



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_34492</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECTS OF PROBIOTICS ON INTESTINAL MICROFLORA OF HIV-INFECTED INDIVIDUALS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I would like to make the following suggestions to the authors to improve the quality of the manuscript even further:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a clinical trial involving humans I would urge the authors to modify their paper according to the CONSORT 2010 statement.</li> <li>2. The authors do not comment on whether an ethics board approved the study. Please elucidate.</li> <li>3. The authors do not state how this study was funded. Please include this in the paper.</li> <li>4. The authors do not mention whether this trial was registered with a clinical trials database, for example clinicaltrials.gov prior to conducting the study. If this was not done, please include as limitation.</li> <li>5. It is not clear what the primary outcome of this study was and when it would have been regarded as positive. If no primary outcome was chosen, please discuss as limitation.</li> <li>6. It is not clear why only 20 patients were chosen to follow and 40 were investigated at baseline. Was there a power calculation or is this a random number?</li> <li>7. It is not clear to me why the authors would distinguish a group I and II. Immunodeficiency is a continuum and a CD4 count of 350 is not a magic number to my understanding. Please explain or otherwise omit these groups.</li> <li>8. I would suggest to combine table 2 and 3 for</li> </ol>	<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 tried to check the general and specific comments provided by the Reviewer and have made necessary changes accordingly to their indications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Study protocol was approved by the Ethics - Committee of the regional center of prevention and control of AIDS in Kharkov</li> <li>- The study was conducted on an outpatient basis of the Department of Microbiology and Clinical Immunology in Kharkiv Medical Academy of Postgraduate Education (KhMAPE).</li> <li>- Thank you for your critical reading and constructive suggestions. 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.</li> <li>- Thank you for the important comment. One of the main criteria for inclusion in the study was compulsory ART therapy, analyzing the data, we divided</li> </ul>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>the 20 patients that were followed to make the comparison easier. Then the authors could consider to compare baseline vs follow-up CFU's of the species. This is more informative than comparing it to a normal population only.</p> <p>9. The authors do not inform the reader where the 'normal' reference ranges come from. Is there a control group? Is this a literature reference? Please explain.</p> <p>10. The authors do not include a strain designation for their probiotic mixture. Which <i>L. rhamnosus</i> were they working with? GR-1? What is the source of these probiotics? Why was this particular mixture selected? Please discuss.</p>	<p>all patients – CD4 &gt; 350 cells/ml - and &lt; 350 cells/ml.</p> <p>Yes, it was a control group (Summarized data of control group (10 healthy adult's) microflora contents served as a normal standard).</p> <p>We used only permitted probiotics ( Ministry of Health of Ukraine), that have proved well in our previous studies.</p>
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Do the authors have more baseline variables on the patients? Were the patients on ARV for example? Any comorbidities? If no further variables known please include as a limitation.</li><li>2. The authors could consider to omit table 1 and include these values instead in the text. It does not seem to add much to have the information in a table.</li><li>3. The referencing is strange as it starts with reference 6 and 12. I would suggest to start with 1 and 2 instead and number throughout.</li><li>4. There are multiple grammatical errors. I would suggest to have this paper checked thoroughly checked on grammar.</li><li>5. What do the authors mean with a 'Dysbiosis correction circuit'. Please omit this wording if not warranted.</li><li>6. Line 13. What do authors mean with (1014)</li><li>7. The author only cite one paper (reference 4) on probiotics and HIV while there is a whole body of literature. Consider to include Int Rev Immunol. 2010 Oct;29(5):485-513. doi: 10.3109/08830185.2010.505310. Review.</li></ol>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		