

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 79162

Title: Virulence markers on clinical outcomes in adult populations

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02440500 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-08-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-16 11:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-16 13:09

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First, As we all know, Helicobacter pylori cannot grow well under "microaerophilic conditions (5% CO2)" conditions, please check whether the culture conditions are written accurately. Second, In terms of the ID of Helicobacter pylori, the bacterial morphology under the microscope and identification of urease, oxidase and catalase should be added. In the application of MALDI-TOF MS identification method, the description of the version number of the comparison database used should be added, because some earlier versions did not identify Helicobacter pylori with high accuracy. Third, In this study, 108 cases were selected, and 108 strains were isolated. Is the success rate of Helicobacter pylori isolation in the experiment 100%? Proper explanation is recommended. The last, In this study, "urease activity was quantified using the rapid urease test (RUT)". The author should explain whether the bacterial growth state and culture time of each isolated strain used to prepare bacterial liquid are the same.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 79162

Title: Virulence markers on clinical outcomes in adult populations

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05770932 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor, Medical Assistant, Postdoc, Research

Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Israel

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-23 09:18

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-23 09:21

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

nothing



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 79162

Title: Virulence markers on clinical outcomes in adult populations

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06380963
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** Israel

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-22 05:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-23 21:51

**Review time:** 1 Day and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	[ Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- The Biostatistics Review Certificate uploaded was made for another article - please upload the correct certificate. - The Signed Informed Consent Document and the Institutional Review Board Approval Document seam to be the same document, and both are not in english - please review and upload the correct documents with appended English translation.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 79162

Title: Virulence markers on clinical outcomes in adult populations

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06381493
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Israel

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-21 19:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-04 01:21

**Review time:** 12 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

https://www.wjgnet.com

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) In Figure 2, is the p-value supposed to be 0.752? It appears to be "752" in the figure. 2) In the Statistical Analysis of Materials & Methods section, it would be better to specify the variables that are used as continuous and categorical variables for this analysis. 3) In the paragraph below Figure 2, it would be better if the acronym O.D could be spelled out as it is used for the first time in the paper. 4) In the sentence in the second paragraph of the discussion section "As only a sample of our isolates were tested for presence of CagA, a higher prevalence of this gene exists among H. pylori strains in Israel may be possible", does it mean that only selected samples were tested for CagA? This sentence confuses the reader, and it would be better if more clarity could be provided. 5) In the sentence in the fourth paragraph of the discussion section – "In light of the above, it is important to profile variants in patients in order to assess disease progression", can you please specify the variants discussed here to enhance the understanding of the reader.