

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_125100
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre and probiotics to postbiotics- A changing paradigm
Type of the Article	Review Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the evolving paradigm from prebiotics and probiotics to postbiotics, highlighting their significance in human health. It effectively synthesizes recent research findings, making it a valuable resource for scientists and healthcare professionals interested in microbiota and its impact on health. The manuscript's thorough exploration of postbiotics, including their production methods and health benefits, is particularly commendable, as it addresses a relatively underexplored area in the field. Overall, I appreciate the manuscript's clarity and depth, which contribute to its relevance in advancing our understanding of gut health.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Pre and Probiotics to Postbiotics - A Changing Paradigm" is suitable as it reflects the manuscript's focus on the transition from prebiotics and probiotics to postbiotics. However, a more engaging alternative could be "From Prebiotics and Probiotics to Postbiotics: Unraveling the Future of Gut Health."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a solid overview of the manuscript's content, but it could benefit from a more explicit mention of the specific health benefits associated with postbiotics. Additionally, including a brief statement on the methodologies used for postbiotic production would enhance the abstract's comprehensiveness. I suggest adding these points to give readers a clearer understanding of the manuscript's contributions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The logical flow from the introduction of microbiota to the detailed discussion of postbiotics allows for a coherent understanding of the topic. Each section builds upon the previous one, facilitating a comprehensive exploration of the subject matter.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it is grounded in recent research and includes a variety of studies that support its claims. The authors have effectively integrated findings from multiple sources, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the complex interactions between microbiota and host health. Furthermore, the inclusion of specific methodologies for postbiotic production and their health implications adds to the manuscript's credibility and relevance in the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and largely recent, reflecting current trends and findings in the field of microbiota research. However, I suggest including additional references that focus on clinical trials involving postbiotics to strengthen the manuscript's claims regarding health benefits. This could provide a more comprehensive view of the evidence supporting postbiotic applications.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and concise language that effectively conveys complex scientific concepts. Minor grammatical adjustments may enhance readability, but overall, the quality is commendable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript presents a timely and relevant topic that is of great interest to the scientific community. I encourage the authors to consider incorporating more case studies or examples of postbiotic applications in real-world scenarios, as this could further engage readers and illustrate the practical implications of their research. Additionally, a discussion on potential challenges in postbiotic research and application could provide a balanced perspective on the topic.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aliasghar Tabatabaei Mohammadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Urmia University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>