



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_15986
Title of the Manuscript:	Helicobacter pylori Stool Antigen in Asymptomatic Children in Lagos State, Nigeria.
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In general, I found this manuscript very preliminary in its content. Abstract In the abstract not is expressed the purpose of the research. The first sentence is introduction. An important aspect that the authors have no clear is that, the organism is associated with gastric pathologies, no antigens in stool ... Maybe the authors wish say that the presence of <i>H. pylori</i> in faeces implies that the main transmission mechanism the bacteria is the fecal-oral route. In the study design I suggest that the authors write more clearly the objective; for example: the aim is to study the prevalence of <i>H. pylori</i> and associated demographic variables in school children in Lagos, Nigeria Introduction In page 1 line 40 place a comma between overcrowding and gender In page 2 line 41 change feaco-oral to fecal-oral In page 2 lines 44 to 46 I suggest that authors change the following paragraph, for example: Although available data suggests that oral-oral and fecal-oral routes are the most likely routes of transmission of <i>H. pylori</i>, yet is not clearly understood its transmission. <i>H. pylori</i> infection is acquired early in life, and generally persists into adulthood In page 2 lines 49 to 52 the paragraph is not clear. Is written	All the issues raised have been adequately addressed in the new correct manuscript and highlighted in yellow ink.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	in a confusing way. The authors wish to express the following concept?.... In the pathogenesis of <i>H. pylori</i> infection is well established that the potent urease allows colonization and persistence of the microorganism in the human stomach, and this persistence over time decreases gastric acid barrier. Therefore this would allow that enteric- pathogens ingested from contaminated food can more rapidly achieved the small intestine and therefore produce of diarrhea In page 2 lines 53 to 57. The paragraph is not clear. Is not clear what wish to express the authors: the epidemiology and mortality rates can not be over expressed as in 1993. The prevalence corresponds to <i>H. pylori</i>? In page 2 line 57 change asyptomatic to asymptomatic In page 2 lines 58 to 61 I suggest at the authors change the paragraph to: There is little information on the association between <i>H. pylori</i> infection and recurrent abdominal pain, prevalence of fecal <i>H. pylori</i> antigen and associated parent socio-demographic status among healthy children in Southwestern Nigeria. Therefore, the prevalence and etiological factors that predispose to <i>H. pylori</i> infection in asymptomatic Children were studied in Lagos State, Nigeria In page 2 line 60 change aetiological to etiological Material and Methods In page 2 line 72 change feecal to fecal Results In general, I suggest to the authors that begin the description of results with the point: <i>H. pylori</i> antigen Fecal prevalence, and then the point: risk factors, in tables Page 3 line 85 Do not match values written in the text with	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the table: males (47.1) y females (52.9) Discussion I observed that the Discussion is written poorly. Is not clear because the authors claim that “Therefore Artisans and Traders acquire infections more readily, become carriers and subsequently transmit the organisms to their children” I could not ensure the transmission from parents to children without evidence confirming that parents and children have the same strains References In the references, authors should follow a judgment respect to the location of the year, ie after the authors, in parentheses. In some references missing pages.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		