

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 84138

**Title:** Safety and effectiveness of vonoprazan-based rescue therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03818597

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Iran

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-27 15:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-01 12:09

**Review time:** 1 Day and 20 Hours

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Scientific quality                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation                                |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>                                     | Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous  |
|   | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Abstract was too long, Please provide shorter abstract while focusing on results as well as conclusion. - Core tip should be covered the present findings. - Please highlight the rationality of this work. the authors should discuss about novelty of this work than previous published relevant papers. - The inclusion and exclusion criteria and the section of Study design and outcomes should be specified with more details. - Figure quality was low. - Discuss regarding study limitation. - Conclusion was missed. the authors should state objective conclusion with further perspectives.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 84138

**Title:** Safety and effectiveness of vonoprazan-based rescue therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00001114

**Position:** Editor-in-Chief

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-28 09:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-05 00:25

**Review time:** 4 Days and 14 Hours

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Scientific quality                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation                                |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>                                     | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous  |
|   | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My comments to the Authors: This study has shown that the 14-day VAS regimen is a safe and effective rescue therapy for H. pylori. This regimen achieved an eradication rate of > 90%, with good patient compliance, especially in patients without anxiety. The results of this study suggest that the 14-day VAS regimen can be recommended as a treatment for H. pylori infections. MATERIALS AND METHODS 1. I wonder if the authors also evaluated medication compliance using a questionnaire administered within three days of treatment. Since two weeks is long, I thought it would be underestimated unless the medication diary was evaluated daily. 2. This study was a pilot study. However, the authors should present the hypotheses and target number of cases in the Methods section. DISCUSSION 1. I am interested in the finding that patients with anxiety disorders are a risk factor for eradication failure. I wondered if they had some drugs for anxiety disorders that could affect the eradication of drug metabolism. In addition, they tend to have more medication. Can polypharmacy affect drug compliance?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 84138

**Title:** Safety and effectiveness of vonoprazan-based rescue therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05072111

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-27 17:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-11 19:08

**Review time:** 12 Days and 1 Hour

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Scientific quality                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation                                |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>                                     | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous  |
|   | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The main purpose of the original article entitled "Safety and effectiveness of vonoprazan-based rescue therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection" was to determine the effectiveness of dual therapy (amoxicillin + vonoprazan) combined with the probiotic strain of *S. boulardii*. In general, I believe that the results obtained are presented in a clear way and are of great importance to clinicians (especially in the context of increasing resistance to antibiotics in *H. pylori*). Nevertheless, there are some issues that require further clarification and/or correction. The list of suggested amendments is presented below: Major: - In the subsection "H. pylori culture and antimicrobial susceptibility testing", there is information about bacterial storage. It was mentioned that the bacteria were stored in BHI but nothing was said about the presence of glycerol (whereas 20% or 30% is added as standard). Has this substance been added? - Where did the MIC values for antibiotic resistance classification of *H. pylori* strains come from? According to commonly used EUCAST recommendations, resistance to antibiotics is: amoxicillin > 0.125 mg/L, tetracycline > 1 mg/L, levofloxacin > 1 mg/L, clarithromycin > 0.5 mg/L and metronidazole > 8 mg/L. Taking these modifications



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgooffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgooffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

into account will certainly have a significant impact on the interpretation of the obtained results. - I believe that the number of people with anxiety (only 5) is far too small to draw conclusions about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of antibiotic therapy. - A big loss for the quality of the manuscript is the lack of a control group in which a supplementation with *S. boulardii* was not used. On this basis, better conclusions could be drawn regarding the need or lack of need for probiotic supplementation during the amoxicillin + vonoprazan therapy. Minor: - Problem with page numbering, e.g. 4/27 and 8/27 appear twice, and some pages are missing - Subsection "H. pylori culture and antimicrobial susceptibility testing" should be numbered as 2.4