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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In the background the description of the question is superficial and references are often cited in an imprecise way:

1a. Line 1 diarrhoea is not an infection, but a symptom; I suggest gastroenteritis. I would say which is the first infectious syndrome causing hospitalization.

1b. Line 4 References 1-3 refer only to USA and not to developing countries

1c. Line 6 The sentence “Each year around 75,000 hospitalizations and nearly 15,000 deaths in the Region of the Americas are attributable to rotavirus” can be found in Ref 4 while Ref 5 describe the constant evolution of rotavirus strain

1d. Line 7 I do not understand where the 40% comes from; what I found in Ref 6 is “1 de cada 5 niños necesita una consulta médica; 1 de cada 26 requirió hospitalizarse y aproximadamente uno de cada 277—476 falleció”

1e. Line 8 A decrease is not described or cited in the reference

1f. Line 13 and 17 The papers describe probiotic treatment

1g. Last paragraph I would rapidly describe the existing products

2. Discussion and conclusion All data are critically discussed, but if the study aimed to compare two different products it should be clearly stated that no conclusive answer was reached. With small samples, important differences (even not significant) in randomization and p value ranging from 0,04 to 0,06 after treatment, the only conclusion is, as written by the authors, that “results support the use of probiotics”.

3. Figure 1: Enrolment the correct number is 76 and not 71

4. Reference 6: the year (2008) is missing

Discretionary Revisions

5. Title As the differences between the two products are not so clear I would omit the sentence “Is better a single species product or multiple species product?” from the title

6. Methods: I would not use “intervened” group, but “intervention” group

7. Results: Even if widely discussed and present in the tables, I would write the p
value (very weak!) also in the test. The presentation of combined intervention groups could better support the use of probiotic.
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