

## **Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** Efficacy of Lactic Acid Bacteria (LAB) supplement in management of constipation among nursing home residents

### **Authors:**

Hyang Mi An ([aashhm@hanmail.net](mailto:aashhm@hanmail.net))  
Eun Hye Baek ([eun-hye4444@nate.com](mailto:eun-hye4444@nate.com))  
Seok Jang ([csclub2@hanmail.net](mailto:csclub2@hanmail.net))  
Do Kyung Lee ([015790@hanmail.net](mailto:015790@hanmail.net))  
Mi Jin Kim ([sanddalki85@hanmail.net](mailto:sanddalki85@hanmail.net))  
Jung Rae Kim ([jrguy@hanmail.net](mailto:jrguy@hanmail.net))  
Kang Oh Lee ([k5lee@syu.ac.kr](mailto:k5lee@syu.ac.kr))  
Jong Gi Park ([webmaster@edenah.com](mailto:webmaster@edenah.com))  
Nam Joo Ha ([hanj@syu.ac.kr](mailto:hanj@syu.ac.kr))

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 5 October 2009

**Author's response to reviews:** see over

October 5, 2009

Editor-In-Chief

Nutrition Journal

Dear Editor in Chief

I would very much like to submit a paper to the "Nutrition Journal". Please review our revised manuscript entitled "Efficacy of Lactic Acid Bacteria (LAB) supplement in management of constipation among nursing home residents." with your kind consideration. This manuscript has not been published in part and is not being considered for publication elsewhere.

I look forward to hearing good news from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Ph.D. Nam Joo Ha, Professor  
Department of Pharmacy  
Sahmyook University  
Seoul 139-742, Korea  
Tel.: 82-2-3399-1607  
Fax: 82-2-3399-1617  
E-mail: hanj@syu.ac.kr

The manuscript was revised as follow;

1. In Fig. 2, there was no explanation for 'A' and 'B' for the indication.

In Fig. 2, the 'A' and 'B' were inserted.

2. The authors should more clearly state the impact of enzymes measured - i.e. explaining why each one is harmful with supporting references.

The composition (Harmful enzyme activities such as  $\beta$ -glucosidase,  $\beta$ -glucuronidase, tryptophanase, and urease of intestinal microflora related to colon cancer were tested in human fecal samples as previously described) was inserted with references [13-15].

3. If available, the authors should report levels of all enzymes measured before and after treatment. A table with numerical data would be preferable. Many have suggested that probiotics improve glucuronidase with potential benefit for estrogen metabolites and breast cancer risk. This is an important negative finding.

Table 6 was inserted instead of Figure 2.

4. The background of the abstract is too long; it can be made more concise.

The background of the abstract was revised more concise.

5. The strains of LAB used here should be mentioned (not only the species *L. acidophilus* but the real strains. If these strains have already been studied with beneficial properties, they deserve to be named probiotics (according to the official definition), if not they should just be named LAB but not probiotics.

The strains of LAB used in this study were showed in page 6 (materials and methods: Bacterial strains) and Table 1.

6. The authors should state which species of bacteria grow on MRS medium

The colonies grow on MRS medium were counted as LAB.

7. What is the evidence to state that b-glucosidase is harmful ? (page 9)

The composition (harmful enzyme activities such as  $\beta$ -glucosidase,  $\beta$ -glucuronidase, tryptophanase, and urease of intestinal microflora can implicate enterohepatic circulation of toxic and carcinogenic substances) was inserted with references [19].

8. Page 12: the unit for the faecal bacterial counts should be given.

The unit was showed with  $\log_{10}$  CFU/g.

9. Discussion page 13, 1st §: the authors mention faecal short chain fatty acids and enterolactone but these have not been measured !

The composition (fecal concentration of short-chain fatty acids and plasma enterolactone) was removed.

10. Table 3 : spelling error : state instead of sate.

State was inserted instead of sate.