

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_125043
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative study of the rate of Helicobacter pylori infection using three diagnostic Techniques among patients in Rivers State
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is still important to health community . H. pylori detection methods are different among health centres around the world and the less sensitive or less specific diagnostic tools are needed to be modified or obsoleted .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and reflect the manuscript nicely.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the abstract , the method section does not focus on the diagnostic methods used in the study. In the result section, you have some points mentioned in the comments, after revision of your results and tables revise the result section in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of value to clarify important diagnostic methods for important carcinogenic bacteria. Although it is repetitive, it can cover the subject in different area of the world.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Ref 3 is an old one, replace it with more new ref.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is good, corrections are required please:</p> <p>1-in materials and methods/study area: no need for excessive description for place of study(highlighted with red color)</p> <p>2-in abstract you mentioned three types of test used: serology, stool antigen and pcr, while in method section you review culture method? Please explain.</p> <p>3- you mentioned too much detail in methods, please summarize it if possible.</p> <p>4-in table 1 you mentioned that antigen method was more sensitive than serology while the table show the opposite, please review your tables and result</p> <p>5-in table 2 no. of cases with positive antigen was 15 out of 180, how can this represent 75%. Explain this.</p> <p>6-5 pcr positive cases out of 15 antigen positive cases represent 33% and not 25% like you mentioned in table 2 or 20 % like you mentioned in discussion. Revise your results and correct percentages please, so you may need to correct even your conclusion based on that.</p> <p>77- figure 1 is not compatible with your finding that were mentioned in tables. Remove it or correct.</p> <p>8-you mentioned in discussion that specificity of antigen test was 95.5%, how you calculate this?, explain please, and how can be of high specificity while only 5 out of 15 cases were positive by pcr.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>corrections are required please:</p> <p>1-in materials and methods/study area: no need for excessive description for place of study(highlighted with red color)</p> <p>2-in abstract you mentioned three types of test used: serology, stool antigen and pcr, while in method section you review culture method? Please explain.</p> <p>3- you mentioned too much detail in methods, please summarize it if possible.</p> <p>4-in table 1 you mentioned that antigen method was more sensitive than serology while the table show the opposite, please review your tables and result</p> <p>5-in table 2 no. of cases with positive antigen was 15 out of 180, how can this represent 75%. Explain this.</p> <p>6-5 pcr positive cases out of 15 antigen positive cases represent 33% and not 25% like you mentioned in table 2 or 20 % like you mentioned in discussion. Revise your results and correct percentages please, so you may need to correct even your conclusion based on that.</p> <p>77- figure 1 is not compatible with your finding that were mentioned in tables. Remove it or correct.</p> <p>8-you mentioned in discussion that specificity of antigen test was 95.5%, how you calculate this?, explain please, and how can be of high specificity while only 5 out of 15 cases were positive by pcr.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Wafaa Redha Al-Sabbagh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Kerbala, College of Medicine, Iraq</p>