

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IRJGH_96884</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Peptic Ulcer Disease; Stomach And Gastric Ulcers, A Concise Review</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes. As the disease is the most prevalence disease the manuscript is important. But providing UpToDate and clear information is required. 2. Yes of course 3. Not! The abstract contains some contradictory ideas to the known facts. It should be rewritten in a correct way. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is ok. 5. Not. The ideas are not UpToDate. It doesn't provide scientific arguments and it needs modification. 6. The references are scarce, large amount of ideas are taken on single article. Many of the references are outdate for example articles published in 2004, 7. The manuscript lacks coherence, ideas are not well categorized into appropriate categories of the structure. 8. Many of the ideas are not completely and correctly discussed in a way to convince a reader. 9. There are huge grammatical errors and confusing jargon words, phrases and ideas, so it requires appropriate grammatical edition software's. 10. There is inappropriate repetition of ideas.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. Not at all.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is better to discuss current updates on the medical technologies concerning Peptic ulcer disease as well as newer investigational drugs that are one the pipelines.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yazachew Engida Yismaw</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bahir Dar University College of Medicine and Health Science, Ethiopia</b>