

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 

Manuscript NO: 89818

**Title:** Retrospective Analysis of Discordant Results between Histology and Other Clinical Diagnostic Tests on Helicobacter pylori Infection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00074490

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-18 11:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-18 12:23

Review time: 1 Hour

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision</li> <li>[ Y] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Helicobacter pylori should be written in italics 2. The C13 urease breath test is often used as the gold standard, and authors should include the breath test as a reference in their articles 3. In results pard, it is strange that the authors did not retest the urease breath test for patients with inconsistent test results as UBT was commonly used in hospital. Generally, the infection status of helicobacter pylori usually requires two or more means of detection. 4. The author's table section needs some major corrections. First, the authors were asked to show the positive rates of these patients with different testing methods in the results section. Secondly, pair-wise tests are required for histology and other different tests, including the mcnemar test and the Chi-square test. 5. Is there a description of the patient's gastric atrophy status? If the patient's gastric mucosa atrophy is very severe, Helicobacter pylori may not be detected 6. In table 4, is there a record of antibiotic use or herb use status for discrepancy cases?



## **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 

Manuscript NO: 89818

**Title:** Retrospective Analysis of Discordant Results between Histology and Other Clinical Diagnostic Tests on Helicobacter pylori Infection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00074490

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-14

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-25 14:08

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-25 14:11

Review time: 1 Hour

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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been well revised and could be accepted for publication