

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Akkermansia Muciniphila –impact on the cardiovascular risk, the intestine inflammation and obesity. Mini Review

Mini Review, Acta Biochim. Pol.

Reviewer: Eliza Wasilewska

Submitted on: 15 Aug 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2024.13550

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the mini review

The article describes the bacterium *Akkermansia muciniphila* as probiotic. The authors of the manuscript tried to present its impact on cardiac diseases and obesity.

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

The topic is interesting, but the quality of the manuscript is poor. Basic errors such as the lack of described methods, changed order of goals and methods, immature discussion and presentation of the topic mean that the article should be completely changed and rewritten. There are also no tables summarizing the literature and main issues contained in a given article. It would be desirable to include a graph presenting the described content in a short, clear way.

The title should be clarified and the abstract presented more clearly and interestingly for the reader. The contribution to the field subsection should also be rewritten and contain specific points.

All this makes the article difficult to accept in its current form.

#### **Q 3** Does the review include a balanced, comprehensive and critical view of the research area?

Yes, it does, but it should be presented in a more professional manner.

### Check List

#### **Q 4** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

No.

#### **Q 5** Is the quality of the figure and/or table satisfactory?

No.

#### **Q 6** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished or original data is not allowed for this article type)

Yes.

**Q 7** Does the manuscript cover the topic in an objective and analytical manner?

Yes.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

**Q 9** Does the manuscript include recent developments?

Yes.

**Q 10** Does the review add new insights to the scholarly literature with respect to previously published reviews?

Yes.

**Q 11** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

The topic is interesting, but the quality of the manuscript is poor. Basic errors such as the lack of described methods, changed order of aims and methods, immature discussion and presentation of the topic mean that the article should be completely changed and rewritten. There are also no tables summarizing the literature and main issues contained in a given article. It would be desirable to include a graph presenting the described content in a short, clear way.

The title should be clarified and the abstract presented more clearly and interestingly for the reader. The contribution to the field subsection should also be rewritten and contain specific points.

All this makes the article difficult to accept in its current form.

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 12** Quality of generalization and summary



**Q 13** Significance to the field



**Q 14** Interest to a general audience



**Q 15** Quality of writing

