

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_118804
Title of the Manuscript:	Gut microbiota and estrogen levels in breast cancer in Côte d'Ivoire.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p> <p>PARTIALLY</p> <p>YES, BUT REVISIONS ARE REQUIRED</p> <p>NO</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There is a lack of details in the METHODOLOGY. The DISCUSSION is too long as the authors discussed about everything and nothing. They had to just focused on the main findings.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Change the title to 'Gut bacteria microbiota and estrogen levels in breast cancer women in Côte d'Ivoire'. Indeed, the authors juts analyzed bacteria microbiota, and also worked on women. You know that breast cancer is also present in men. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add bibliographic references for all statements in this section. ○ Line 22: Change CO2 to CO₂ ○ The names of genes should be put in italics ○ Lines 40 – 41: The authors should remove this sentence, or more elaborate about bioinformatics. I don't understand why they authors talked about bioinformatics, and what is its link with gut microbiota and estrogens in breast cancer? ○ What the term 'E2' stands for? <p>Materials and Methods</p>	

Review Form 1.7

- Lines 50 – 51 & 71: Put the French terms in italics.
 - Line 52: What did the author make two groups of patients (one premenopausal + one postmenopausal) and two of controls (one premenopausal + one postmenopausal)?
 - Lines 57 – 59: Move this sentence to more adequate section. This is not about women recruitment, but ethical considerations instead.
 - Lines 64 – 65: Give more details about data collected from each participant.
 - Line 68: Why collected during the follicle phase? The authors should clearly explain that.
 - Line 69: Give details about kit used to collect stool samples.
 - Lines 73 – 74: Give details about the procedures of measurement, and how data were interpreted.
 - Lines 84 – 86: Give all details about this procedure.
 - Lines 88 – 91: Move this section to the STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.
 - Lines 96 – 99: Add bibliographic references to these techniques.
 - How sample size was computed?
- Results**
- Table 1: Add a caption to this table. For example, which statistical test was used? What the data presented mean?
 - Table 2: Add a caption to this table.
 - Table 2: Change 'Witnesses' to 'Controls'.
 - Figure 1: Add statistical significance on these graphs.
 - Figure 1: Why you change the terms "cases' and 'controls' to 'Breast cancer' and 'Healthy group'? Please update the figure.
 - Lines 157 – 160: Add details of data as supplementary file. We need to make sure that these data are real.
 - Figure 3: Increase the font size.
 - Figure 3: Add statistical significance on this graph.
- Discussion**
- Lines 204 – 210: Remove this paragraph. Just focused on your main findings.
 - Lines 211 – 216: Remove this paragraph. Just focused on your main findings.
 - Lines 217 – 221: Remove this paragraph. Just focused on your main findings.
 - Lines 222 – 225: Remove this paragraph. Just focused on your main findings.
 - Lines 226 – 232: This is not a discussion. Also, don't discuss not statistically significant result, unless if the absence of significance allows to explain a biological phenomenon.
 - Lines 233 – 239: Remove this paragraph. Just focused on your main findings.
 - Lines 255 – 264: Remove this paragraph. Just focused on your main findings.
 - Lines 265 – 266: Remove this sentence.

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Lines 267 – 268: Was this difference in microbiomes statistically significant? What might explain an increase in the phyla Actinobacteria and Verrucomicrobia in breast cancer patients?○ Add limitations of the study. <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This section is not properly presented as per the journal's guidelines.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Koanga Mogtomo Martin Luther
Department, University & Country	The University of Douala, Cameroon