

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_91083
Title of the Manuscript:	Single-Center Review of Appropriateness and Utilization of Upper GI-Endoscopy in Dyspepsia – A Retrospective study.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://journalirjgh.com/index.php/IRJGH/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The idea of performing this study is very commendable. It is important to note that most of the the UGI endoscopies done for dyspepsia are normal. It is very important to establish the guideline on whom EGD should be performed to make it a cost effective procedure.</p> <p>In this study it is not clear if biopsies were taken to rule out H.Pylori or not. It is not clear if objective evidence of reflux disease (LA classification for esophagitis or presence of Barrett's esophagitis)was present or not because these findings may change the management of the disease. In addition rapid urease test was done which may not be reliable for presence of H.pylori infection.</p> <p>The study method states retrospective, however it seems like prospective study because the patient were selected for EGD. If the EGD were already performed, what was the inclusion criteria to select the patients?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Describe what are "alarm symptoms"? for the purpose of this study.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Sudha Pandit
Department, University & Country	LSU Health, USA