

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_96884
Title of the Manuscript:	Peptic Ulcer Disease; Stomach And Gastric Ulcers, A Concise Review
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. 1. Yes, mainly because it reviews important diagnostic issues and what is currently known about the diseases covered in the article.</p> <p>2. 2. Yes, quite suitable.</p> <p>3. 3. The summary is as needed.</p> <p>4. 4. Yes, there are some suggestions that will be made in the general comments thread, but nothing that harms the structure of the work.</p> <p>5. 5. Yes.</p> <p>6. 6. Yes, they are also in accordance with the necessary requirements.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, that's correct.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	I suggest dividing the first paragraph of the introduction into 2 or 3. Add more references during the introduction as it has a very long text and almost no references.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mikaela Clotilde da Silva
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Campina Grande, Brazil