

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79700
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness of the general population about the causes, management and prevention of gastro duodenal ulcer in Arar City, Northern Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalipri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Preliminary notes.</b></p> <p><i>I did my comments with the presumption that this study was conducted by and intended for clinicians and/or pharmacists. All my critical remarks below would be irrelevant if the authors were statisticians whose work would only serve local or national statistics. If the latter is the case, the editors might wish to consider whether the manuscript falls in or out the scope of this journal.</i></p> <p><b>About the Abstract.</b></p> <p>Most researchers read only the abstracts. Too many figures in the Abstract makes it difficult to read. That is why concise and eye-catching statements relevant to the proposed changes in the main body should find place in the abstract.</p> <p><b>About the Introduction:</b></p> <p>Presented in the way it is, I am not sure what the goal of this study is. The clinical information of the Introduction section is not necessary. If the authors willingly enter into the jungle of the medical aspect of Peptic Ulcer Disease (PUD), this will lead the readers well away from the topic of this study. In other words, I find the presented <b>Introduction</b> of the manuscript irrelevant to the title of this research.</p> <p>My recommendations to the authors in regards to the <b>Introduction</b> section are as follows:</p> <p>Please forget about the etiology, pathogenesis, clinical presentation and diagnosis of PUD.</p> <p>Instead, the <b>Introduction</b> must contain the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why awareness of a disease, in particular of PDU, is important? Is PUD a socially significant disease?</li><li>• What kind of research the authors did internationally to retrieve other publications on this topic (references are needed)? Which databases they searched for the purpose of their study?</li><li>• How the present study contributes to already published data worldwide?</li><li>• Most of the issues discussed in the first two paragraphs of the <b>Discussion</b> section should go in the <b>Introduction</b> part.</li></ul> <p>About the <b>Discussion</b> section:</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Authors should make emphasis on the importance of the activities aimed at increasing the level of PUD-awareness in the community; this will promote the early diagnosis and treatment of PUD. The latter in turn will lower costs for in-hospital treatment of severely ill patients. It will reduce the pressure on social security to pay for sick-leaves and ultimately will decrease mortality from ulcer complications. Researchers should also stress on the statement that only 3 decades ago elective surgery was the accepted mode for cure of PUD. Whereas nowadays conservative treatment with **pharmaceutical** agents is the gold standard for dealing with this disease. The drugs used to treat PUD are antibiotics for H.pylory eradication and Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPI) for acid control. Operative treatment is reserved only for ulcer complications and for refractive to conservative treatment ulcers, especially for those in the stomach.

About the **Study** itself.

The authors have done a tremendous job, very professionally at that. That is why I tried to do my best to help authors see their study published. Nevertheless, it would be good if the questionnaire contained the following question: "How many of the high PUD-aware people and how many of the low PUD-aware group were admitted for hospital treatment?" The answer of this question would have given the authors a good reason to make the below-proposed plan.

About the **Conclusion** section:

Analysis of collected data is always done for the sake of a plan to change an unfavourable status and reach desirable goals. The authors present a good analysis

but it appears that this was done for the sake of the analysis itself as it is not followed by a plan.

My proposal for a plan and recommendations is based on the answers of the following questions:

- How can awareness or unawareness of PUD make the difference in regards to public health and costs for in-hospital treatment?
- How did people in the region receive relevant information about PUD? Was it all by chance and if "Yes", in the future it should be done in an organized manner. Who must be in charge in this process: family doctors Healthcare authorities, or both?

## Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The authors should point out the limitations of their study which are its short period (2 months) and the low number of participants (420).	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors should avoid repetitions of words phrases, and statements. They should not compose long sentences of more than 22-25 words. The researchers should not start a sentence with a figure or a number. There should be linking devices between sentences and paragraphs to make the reading fluent and cohesive.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ognyan Milev</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>St Petka Multiprofile Hospital, Bulgaria</b>