

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Tween 80™-Induced Changes in Fatty Acid Profile of Selected Mesophilic Lactobacilli

Original Research, Acta Biochim. Pol.

Reviewer: Ghada A. Mohammad

Submitted on: 29 Apr 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2024.13014

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

the main findings of the study were that:

- 1- using the substrate Tween 80 in the growth medium of lactobacilli can change the fatty acids composition of the species of this bacterium.
- 2- tween 80 stimulates the lactobacilli growth.
- 3- tween 80 increases saturated fatty acids and decreases unsaturated fatty acids.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The limitations lie in

- 1- Writing an explanation of the abbreviations along the research is not at the first appearance but after that.
- 2- lack the images that enhance the research

the strength lies in

- 1- the researchers' use of many species without being satisfied with one.
- 2- The researcher detailed presentation of the almost complete composition of fatty acids

#### **Q 3** Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

- methods are written in simple, clear way.
  - The results were meticulously detailed.... Just note about the abbreviations that were not clarified previously , and then the researcher clarifies later... It is preferable if the meaning of the abbreviation is mentioned at its first appearance. like: St/Lb ; O/V ; U/S ; the line 163 and 164 then appeared the U/S in the line 227 and so on... CLA in the line 230, BAME in the line 267.
- also the researcher can delete the writings in lines from 203–206.
- in the line 217, how could dihydrosterculic acid be used to differentiate between *L. casei* and *L. paracasei*?
- the conclusion is seutable.

### Check List

#### **Q 4** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List)

Previous observations can be viewed directly to the researcher

#### **Q 5** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

#### **Q 6** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

**Q 7** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

**Q 8** Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

**Q 9** Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes.

**Q 10** Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Yes.

**Q 11** Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

**Q 12** Have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

No answer given.

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** Originality



**Q 14** Rigor



**Q 15** Significance to the field



**Q 16** Interest to general audience



**Q 17** Quality of the writing



**Q 18** Overall quality of the study

