

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	Manuscript for Journal publication

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>By considering the hormone-induced breast cancer incidence caused by gut microbiota in the developing countries, this manuscript is very importance to the scientific community. It added new knowledge in identification, characterization and quantification of gut microbiota phyla associated with increased plasma Estradiol 2 concentration which are known in causing breast cancer, among postmenopausal women in Cote d' Ivore.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable to the manuscript; the study identified and characterized the gut microbiota phyla that posses the gut genes associated with high serum E2 level in female breast cancer cases.</p> <p>The article is comprehensive and a concise summary of the manuscript. The molecular analysis of variance of the study, and the identified gut microbiota genera (Blautia, Dorea, and Bifidobacterium) was not mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate and coincide with the aims and objectives of the study. The structures and tables are useful tools that organised the data and provided a clear idea that strengthen the study.</p> <p>By considering the article title, the methodology, the result and the conclusion, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, by considering the 4th paragraphs of the discussion sections, the author did not established an association between BMI, family history and the use of hormonal contraceptives in the case-control study. There has been a documented previous study on these that confirms the association.</p> <p>Only two reference years (1996 & 2003) were outdated. Others are recent and provide up to date information that follows a consistency in the referencing style. However, the references were not arranged in alphabetical pattern. Overall, the references was sufficient and provides a clear supportive background to the research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article has few grammatical errors that do not coincide with scholarly communication. But overall, it conveys research ideas, methodologies, and research findings that will be important and accessible by the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Introduction section of the manuscript lacks paragraphing. The manuscript does not contain any specific research questions which are always useful in making decision about the study design and case-control study, and subsequently what data will be collected and analyzed.</p> <p>In materials and methodology sections of the manuscripts, the correct method for sample collection was used both for the case-control population. The samples were transported on time to the lab. and stored at the right temperature. These decrease the risk of sample contamination and distortion, which contributed to result accuracy, validity and reproducibility.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Ugochukwu O. Maluze
Department, University & Country	University of Sydney, Australia