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Hiromichi Kumagai  
Deputy-Editor-in-Chief  
Nutrition J

Dear Sir,

You will find enclosed a modified version of the manuscript reference MS: 1982402604740638 entitled "The Capacity of short-chain fructo-oligosaccharides to Stimulate Fecal Bifidobacteria: A Dose-Response Relationship Study in Healthy Humans", with a separate point-by-point answer to the reviewer.

We hope that the manuscript will be now suitable for publication in your review. Whatever your decision, I would like to thank you and the reviewer for the pertinent remarks, which have helped us to improve the manuscript.

Yours faithfully

Prof. Yoram Bouhnik
Point-by-point answer to the reviewer

1. Abstract: The grammar had been checked in the revised manuscript.

2. Background: The sentences were rewritten.
   The background underlying why this study was undertaken is explained in the revised manuscript.

3. Subjects and Methods:
   - The bismuth is forbidden in France.
     More details about scFOS composition were added in the revised manuscript.
   - Some examples of the food products which the subjects were asked to avoid were given in the revised manuscript.
     Page 6: The stool consistency was graded by the volunteer himself.
     Page 6: The stool specimen was refrigerated at 4 °C during the transport to the laboratory.
     Page 7: The data analysis is explained in section “material and methods”

4. Results:
   - The Table 1 is present in the revised manuscript.
   - There is no time line on Figure 1.
   - Page 8: Nausea is not mentioned in the revised manuscript.

5. Discussion:
   All the remarks of the reviewer were considered in the revised manuscript.