

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_112824
Title of the Manuscript:	Expert opinion on the prescription practice of proton pump inhibitor for the treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewrite this sentence "An overwhelming 97% and 90% of respondents preferred rabeprazole, acknowledging its rapid onset of action and suitability for long-term administration in the context of nighttime heartburn among GERD patients". This sentence was repeated and edit it everywhere in the paper. 2. Abstract. Conclusion is not convincing!! 3. There are some grammatical errors in the paper' text. Edit them. 4. Enter the method of preparing the questionnaire in the text of the article. Also report the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. 5. Edit the sentences that start with numbers. 6. Enter the obtained code of ethics in the relevant part of the methods. 7. Statistical analysis should be revised. 8. The conclusion of the article is weak. According to the obtained results, the conclusion could be improved. 9. Use newer references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Almost.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beydolah Shahouzei
Department, University & Country	Cardiovascular Research Center, Institute of Basic and Clinical Physiology Sciences, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Iran