

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_123532</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Analysis of Stool Antigen and PCR Tests for Diagnosing Helicobacter pylori Infection and Associated Gut Dysbiosis in Wad-Medani City, Sudn</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	It addresses the need for effective and non-invasive diagnostic methods for <i>H. pylori</i> detection by comparing stool antigen tests (SAT) and PCR methods, and provides valuable insights into their diagnostic accuracy and potential as reliable tools for epidemiological studies. Clearly figure out the accuracy of rapid and cost-effective <i>H. pylori</i> detection method relation to molecular techniques.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title clearly indicates the focus of the study, which is the comparison of two diagnostic methods for <i>H. pylori</i> infection.	
<b>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.</b>	It should be specifying the health significance of <i>H. pylori</i> infection and its association with gut dysbiosis, it may be beneficial to add a sentence that highlights why this research is important for public health.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript ideally follows a standard format commonly accepted in scientific writing.	
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is scientifically and technically sound, offering a comprehensive evaluation of <i>H. pylori</i> detection methods by utilizing both stool antigen tests (SAT) and polymerase chain reaction (PCR), the study enhances the validity of its findings through comparative analysis. Employing well-established methodologies for DNA extraction, PCR amplification, and 16S rRNA gene sequencing, along with statistical analyses, further strengthens the credibility of the results.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are substantial and relevant but should be reviewed for redundancy and should be potentially updated with the most recent literature.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There are areas that could be refined to enhance clarity, grammatic, sentence's structure and professionalism.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, the manuscript is well-prepared for scholarly communication, but refining the language and addressing the identified issues will enhance its quality and readability. Consider revising for clarity, consistency, and formal tone, and ensure meticulous proofreading.  There are no indications of competing interest issues. However, the manuscript does not explicitly state whether the authors have declared any conflicts of interest. It is common practice for scientific papers to include a section on Competing Interests.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	The author's state that approved ethical of the study from Ministry of Health of Gezira State and the Faculty of Medical Laboratory Sciences, University of Gezira, but It would be helpful to provide the ethics committee approval number and the date of approval to provide complete transparency.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zerihun Asefa Biru</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia</b>