



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_18719
Title of the Manuscript:	A review article on Helicobacter pylori antibiotic resistant profile in Iran
Type of the Article	Review 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	The sentences should not start with number. Before using the acronyms, they must be elucidated (abstract). Line 11: "consecutive" with no capital letter Line 46: "world" Line 120. show the number of patients not only the percentage. The discussion paragraph should be written in a more simple and logic way. Many sentences are too long and rather difficult to understand. Moreover the authors compared their results with old studies which are now outdated (many references have more than ten years) therefore the authors must update the references. The total number of patients is adequate, but having subdivided them in many groups, each one have a low number of patients therefore the reliability of results become poor.	Thank you for your time and consideration. It seems these suggestions are not related to the recent article (A review article on <i>Helicobacter pylori</i> antibiotic resistant profile in Iran) Because there are not "consecutive" in line 11 and "world" in line 46. Also this article doesn't have discussion paragraph. This article was written as a review article so no patient sampling was included in it.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I think this study could only get an indirect feel of local distribution of the antibiotic resistance because of the low number of patients. For the same reason, regarding the effectiveness of triple therapy, I think we are not sure that these eradication rates are real and applicable to the whole population of that country.	