



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_19580
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-Helicobacter pylori, non-NSAID peptic ulcer disease
Type of Article:	Review Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The titles of mentioned manuscripts seems that it is not relevant with the manuscript. If the authors read fulltext of both of the article, they may have chance to enrich the manuscript.	I have modified the title of my paper to read "Non-Helicobacter pylori, non-NSAID peptic ulcer disease: an important consideration in the evaluation of patients with gastric or duodenal ulcers." This in response to the original comment that there is a previous article with a similar heading and therefore the crossover is reduced. The expanded title I feel is appropriate in that it better summaries the content of the paper. I have again read the mentioned manuscripts as suggested. I still do not believe that mentioning of Dielafoy lesions is pertinent or necessary to this paper ("Dieulafoy Lesion in the Stomach Case Reports in Gastroenterology 09/2008; 2(3):469-73). There are innumerable causes of upper gastrointestinal bleeding that I could begin to discuss with minimal relevance, equally important as Dielafoy lesions, but they are beyond the scope of this article. Similarly, the second article regarding gastric cancer is also not appropriate to reference (A new prognostic strategy for gastric carcinoma: albumin level and metastaticlymph node ratio). Gastric adenocarcinoma is not mentioned once in my paper and introduction of this topic is not highly relevant, especially in the conclusion as recommended. I do raise the issue of gastrinomas in my text, however these are completely separate neoplasms. Gastric cancer is not ulcerogenic. I do not fully understand the reviewers comment in this document. It is unclear. I believe he



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

	is stating either my article's title is not appropriate or the inclusion of the recommended two articles from the first revision would be advised. I disagree, with utmost respect, with both suggestions but do acknowledge them.
--	---