



**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Overall, this manuscript presents evidence that probiotic interventions in HIV-1 infected patients increased beneficial bacteria and decreased opportunistic pathogens. However, there are some concerns that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Line 13-14: Not sure what is trying to be said here.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Overall, it is not specific enough. Please provide more detail. Was any sequencing or even PCR performed? Also provide references for the selective media used.</p> <p>Tables 2 and 3: Please provide some explanation what the numbers presented represent. I see two lines per organism and do not know what they mean. Also, what does "Normal" pertain to? Overall, it would be more useful to have before and after numbers in the same table (or even better a bar chart) so that it is easier to make a comparison for each organism. Perhaps combine both tables, and then also add a bar chart with combined average beneficial bacteria levels before and after, and the same for pathogenic bacteria.</p> <p>Discussion section: Overall, discussion of the results observed in the paper could be expanded. A lot of time is spent discussing specific immune mechanisms even though no work observing immune cell levels in the patients was done. A more general statement saying that probiotic bacteria bolster the immune system should be good. Also, please mention that stool samples were taken, which are not entirely representative of the microbiota of the gut (the colon is overrepresented). Please discuss this and the limits of inferring quantitative changes in the gut using stool. It is possible that the treatment had little effect in the small intestine.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Line 133: Add references to support your point that it has been	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	observed before. Shouldn't <i>lactobacilli</i> be capitalized?	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The English of this work should be improved, some things were not clear.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Matthew D. Moore</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Department of Food, Bioprocessing and Nutrition Sciences, North Carolina State University, USA</i></b>