

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_128152
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological, clinical, histological, therapeutic and evolutionary profile of patients with Helicobacter Pylori (HP) infection: Prospective study
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The introduction rambles a bit and does not focus well on the objective of the present study. There is information that is not clearly related to the study and could be eliminated (for example this one: An interesting study from the USA identified the degree of African ancestry as an independent predictor of H. pylori infection).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Please check grammar (see above). Do not use abbreviations in the title.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>Please confirm that the abstract follows the journal's publication guidelines (it is longer than 300 words).</p> <p>Do not abbreviate <i>H. pylori</i> (HP) in the abstract.</p> <p>The Background section of the abstract is too long, while the Results section is too brief (more details are needed).</p> <p>Please provide percentages for histological lesions: non-atrophic gastritis, dysplasia, and intestinal metaplasia.</p> <p>Please round decimals in figures higher than 10.</p> <p>Please provide percentages of use of the different eradication treatments.</p> <p>The authors conclude that "HP infection is highly responsive"; however, <80% eradication rates cannot be considered highly response but insufficient.</p> <p>All conclusions included in the abstract should be based on the results provided in the same abstract. However, the following conclusions cannot be inferred from them: ...more so in young women than in men, more important in the 23-35 age group.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Were the patients consecutively included?</p> <p>Please provide more details about the setting where the patients were included.</p> <p>"including 86 patients with <i>H. pylori</i> infection". This is not part of the methods but of the results. How many patients were evaluated to finally find these 86 patients?</p> <p>Serology is not a sufficiently reliable technique (and certainly much less reliable than ¹³C-urea breath test or stool antigen test).</p> <p>Statistical analysis: for quantitative variables, in addition to percentages, 95% confidence intervals should be calculated and provided.</p> <p>Was the sample size calculated in advance?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Please explain in more detail the treatments administered: their components, dosage, and duration, as well as their frequency of use.</p> <p>The frequency of adverse effects should be reported (not just those that led to discontinuation of treatment).</p> <p>Define in advance (in Methods) what was considered "excellent" compliance.</p> <p>Eradication efficacy should be given both on a per-protocol basis (i.e., including only patients who successfully completed treatment) and on an intention-to-treat basis. This should also be included in the Methods section.</p> <p>Information on compliance and adverse events should be given separately for each of the two eradication treatments.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The discussion should focus exclusively on the results obtained in the present study, without making comments that have nothing to do with it.</p> <p>The results of this study should be put more in relation to those obtained in the country or geographical area where it was carried out.</p> <p>The Maastricht V consensus is mentioned, but it would be better to refer to the latest version (VI).</p> <p>It should be stressed that the eradication rates obtained in this study are clearly insufficient (since they are well below the generally established threshold of 90%, to consider a treatment as acceptable).</p> <p>A section dedicated to the strengths and limitations of the study is missing.</p> <p>In order to conclude that "H. pylori infections are more common in females than males" it would be necessary to have studied the entire population of patients in whom the prevalence of H. pylori has been studied (i.e., including both H. pylori positive and negative patients). Since this study only includes H. pylori positive patients, this conclusion cannot be drawn. And the same with age.</p> <p>REFERENCES</p> <p>Several of the references are quite old and should be replaced by more up-to-date ones.</p> <p>TABLES</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>FIGURES</p> <p>Figure 1 is unnecessary, as its data can easily be included in the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The presentation of the article should be improved (double spacing of text, page numbering, avoiding white spaces between text, etc.)</p> <p>Please review the spelling of <i>Helicobacter pylori</i> (in italics and with a lowercase p) throughout the document.</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>Javier P Gisbert</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas, Spain</p>