

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_102787
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence of Helicobacter pylori IgG Antibodies and associated Risk Factors among Asymptomatic Vegetable Sellers in Uyo, South South Nigeria
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>Please use the “<i>H. pylori</i>” abbreviation through the manuscript.</p> <p>The text should be reviewed by a native English speaker.</p> <p>TITLE</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>The authors state “Vegetables serve as vehicle for the transmission of pathogenic microorganisms like <i>Helicobacter pylori</i>”. However, this is just a hypothesis (supported by few studies) so this statement should be weighted (for example stating: “it has been suggested...”).</p> <p>The authors point out all the risk factors associated with <i>H. pylori</i> infection: “Risk factors like age, marital status, residency family size, years in vegetable business, source of vegetable, wash before stalling, eating veg. while cleaning, use cleaned instrument, convenience type, hand washing after convenience, how often do you eat meat, spicy food intake, fried food intake, number per room, waste disposal type of house floor soil”. Instead of giving too detailed information in the abstract, I suggest summarizing them using a concept (or just a few ones).</p> <p>Additional information could be included in the Results section.</p> <p>The authors conclude that “This study revealed that unhygienic behaviors by vegetable sellers expose vegetable buyers to risk of <i>H. pylori</i> infection”. This is a daring conclusion, as the present study can only suggest an “association” but not a “causation” link.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>METHODS</p> <p>Please provide more information on the random sampling technique that was used in this study.</p> <p>Please clarify if having received an <i>H. pylori</i> eradication treatment previously was an exclusion criteria.</p> <p>Was the age (adults, children) an inclusion/exclusion criteria?</p> <p>It is unclear how the authors calculated the sample size (142 individuals); please provide more information on this estimation.</p> <p>Patients receiving proton pump inhibitors or antibiotics for the past one month were excluded. However, <i>H. pylori</i> serology is not influenced by these factors.</p> <p>The performance/accuracy of the PROMED Rapid Diagnostic test (in previous studies) should be provided.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The performance/accuracy of the Accu-Diag TM ELISA kit Cat 1506 (in previous studies) should be provided.</p> <p>It should be clearly stated the definition of a <i>H. pylori</i>-positive case; based on the serology? Based on the stool test? In both?</p> <p>All the sociodemographic variables that were included in the study should be detailed in the Methods section; furthermore, the classification of each variable should be explained, if necessary (for example: education, convenience type, etc.).</p> <p>The statistical study section should be completed: only the chi-square test was used. A multivariate analysis (for example, multiple logistic regression analysis) would be highly recommended.</p> <p>The main limitation of the present study is the low diagnostic accuracy of the rapid serology test; and the high discrepancy between the serum and stool diagnostic methods used.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>If a multivariate analysis is finally performed, please provide their results.</p> <p>95% confidence intervals should be provided, at least for the most relevant percentages.</p> <p>Some variables (such as hand washing) were not found to be statistically associated with <i>H. pylori</i> prevalence, but this may be simply due to the low sample size and the corresponding lack of statistical power (beta error).</p> <p>In this respect, there was no significant association between having a history of peptic ulcer and the prevalence of <i>H. pylori</i> infection, which is in marked contrast with the literature findings.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>Please comment with more detail, in the Discussion, on the main limitation of the present study: the low diagnostic accuracy of the rapid serology test; and the high discrepancy between the serum and stool diagnostic methods used.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, the low sample size and the corresponding lack of statistical power may explain the lack of statistical significance for some relevant comparisons; this should be acknowledged in the text.</p> <p>The authors point out that “The lack of association with a history of peptic ulcer can be explained by the fact that those with no history of peptic ulcer had the highest <i>H. pylori</i> prevalence rate in this study”. This cannot be considered a valid explanation, so please elaborate on other potential explanations for these controversial results.</p> <p>The authors state “There was a statistically significant association ($p < 0.05$) between a history of using proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) and <i>H. pylori</i> infection. This association may be due to the fact that long-term use of PPIs can induce a provocative reaction in the stomach mucosa...”. However, serological test should not be influenced by PPI intake. Please comment on this apparent discordance.</p> <p>The authors conclude that “<i>H. pylori</i> infection is more common in developing countries and can be spread from vegetables through person-to-person, oral-oral and fecal-oral routes of transmission”. However, this conclusion implies an overreach of the results of the study, and therefore should be more weighted. The authors should only conclude what they have been able to demonstrate directly in their study, that is, an association (which does not necessarily imply causation) between various variables and the prevalence of <i>H. pylori</i> infection.</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	REFERENCES Several mistakes have been detected in the References' section; please review them in detail.	
	TABLES OK.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Intermediate	
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Javier
Department, University & Country	Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Spain